
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by J Wilson BA Hons BTP MRTPI DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/18/3207963
100a Gayford Road, London W12 9BW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Hustwit against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2017/03805/FUL, dated 28 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is a proposed glazed box and roof terrace over existing apartment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Located mid terrace in a predominantly residential area the property is part of a row of two storey flat roofed properties with parapet detailing and which retain a uniform and traditional appearance. These properties are in a curved alignment and connect two parallel terraces in Gayford Road and Cobbold Road. The rear of the property is visible between the rear elevations of both of those terraces.
4. The appeal property comprises the upper floor of the building with two bedrooms in the main part and the living room and kitchen in the rear projection. The scheme proposes a glass roof box located on the roof of the main building intended to create sufficient head height to enable the formation of an access to a new roof terrace located above the kitchen which would be formed into a seating area surrounded by balustrading formed from 1.8 metre high frosted glass.
5. Whilst the glass box would occupy 40% of the roof area the height of it would sit well above the parapet and would be of a height roughly equivalent to the top of the main chimneys (but not the chimney pots). The structure would not be seen from street level but even though located to the rear of the terrace would be visible from across the street and from longer views at the rear of the property particularly from between the two terraces. To that extent even

though it would be of modest footprint and clear glazed it would represent a framed structure which would intrude above the roofline in a group of properties where the roofs are consistently uninterrupted with the exception of the chimney stacks. The glazed box would stand significantly above the parapet height representing a feature out of keeping with the traditional detailing of the terrace. Despite it being designed to be of a generally comparative height to the chimneys, it would be read as an incongruous and discordant feature at odds with the simple roof form of the appeal property and the properties that adjoin it.

6. Whilst there has been a significant amount of alteration to the rear roof slopes of the terraced properties which run perpendicular to the appeal site these alterations are generally set against existing roofs. Some of these properties have incorporated roof terraces, however those which I saw did not breach the highest point of the roof on the properties which they sit. The appellant argues there is no planning guidance that specifies that the roofline should not be breached. Whilst this is element is not specified in the wording of the policies in the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan). It is clear to me that relevant policies seek to ensure that alterations create a high-quality urban environment which respects and enhances the townscape. They make clear that alterations and extensions should be subservient and should never dominate the parent building in bulk, scale or design and are therefore relevant to the appeal proposal.
7. The height of the balustrading around the terrace would be visually obtrusive at the rear of the property, standing at a height of 1.6 metres above what would be a new parapet; and above the height of the parapet on the main roof. Given its frosted materials, intended to preserve privacy for the appellant and neighbouring residential properties, it would not appear as an invisible structure. Its height, position and relationship with the building would be visually prominent at the rear of the terrace which would be visible over a wider area than the immediately adjacent properties and causing harm to the appearance of the terrace.
8. The glass features would represent incongruous and obtrusive additions, they would detract from the unspoilt character of the terrace and would intrude above the existing roof to an unacceptable degree and would harm both the character and appearance of the building.
9. Consequently, there would be conflict with Policies DC1, DC4 and HO11 of the Local Plan; to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies together seek to ensure that high standards of design are achieved; that developments are compatible with the scale and character of existing development and are subservient to the parent building and respect the principles of good neighbourliness.

Other matters

10. The appellant believes the design of the proposal should not have been brought into question as he argues similar schemes have been approved by the Council. My attention has been drawn to two other roof alterations local to the appeal site. I viewed both sites and note that the first represents an extension in the context of an existing roof form altering the rear roof slope to form a mansard extension screened by a parapet wall. The second was a substantial extension set between two parapet walls which I noted had replicated other previous

extensions elsewhere along the same terrace. Both examples were not of a comparable design to the appeal proposal nor did they have the same relationship with the host dwelling as this proposal would. In this regard they are not developments which would justify the appeal scheme. In any event, I have come to my decision based on the merits of the appeal proposal in the context of the effect on the building and the surrounding properties.

11. The appellant has raised concerns about the time taken by the Council to deal with the application and the behaviour of the Council's officer who the appellant argues responded positively to the plans in the first instance. This is not a matter for me to comment on in the context of this appeal as it is the decision of the Council which I must address and not any prior expressed opinion of an individual planning officer.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out and having considered all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR