



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 01 April 2019

by N Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/19/3220717

9 Walham Grove, Fulham, London, SW6 1QP

- 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 and Mrs Guy Wengraf against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2018/03356/FUL, dated 09 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is installation of one rooflight in the front facing roof slope and one rooflight in the side facing roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of one rooflight in the front facing roof slope and one rooflight in the side facing roof slope at 9 Walham Grove, Fulham, London, SW6 1QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2018/03356/FUL, dated 09 October 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P-01 C, P-02 C, P-03 C, P-04 C, P-05 C and P-06 C.
 - 3) Details of the design and profile of the roof lights shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their installation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. I have amended the description of the development from that set out on the planning application form so as to remove reference to the development for which planning permission has been granted. As I saw on my visit, that development has commenced. This appeal relates to two roof lights, that could be carried out with or without the other works taking place.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the appearance of the development, including its effect on the character and appearance of the Walham Grove Conservation Area and Building of Merit, would be acceptable.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a three storey, terraced house. Planning permission has been granted for, and work has commenced on, various extensions to the property, including a rear roof extension.
5. Whilst front and site facing roof lights are not at particularly prominent feature of housing on the south side of the road, I did note on my visit that they had been installed in the roof slopes of a number of properties along that side of the road, including at No 7, adjacent to the appeal site.
6. Given the shallow pitches of the roof slopes along the road, they did not appear to me to be unduly prominent or visually jarring despite what is, a fairly consistent street scene, including at roof level. I have no reason to think that similar development at the appeal development would be any more visually harmful than those existing examples and I note that 'Conservation' style lights are proposed.
7. I am satisfied that the introduction of two roof lights at the property would not undermine the appearance of the house or its design and given that views of them would be fairly limited, would not result in visual harm being caused.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to an approval for what appears to be a similar form of development at No 22. I note that this permission was granted in 2015 and that the Local Plan was adopted in 2018, but there is nothing before me to suggest that the policy position in respect of such development has changed significantly. I also note that planning permission was refused for extensions at No 5 Walham Grove in 2018 and that whilst a roof light in the front roof slope was proposed, it did not feature in the Council's reasons for refusing the application.
9. I note that an Article 4 Direction is in place, which prevents alterations to properties in this area without planning permission first having been secured, but that does not mean that acceptable development cannot take place, subject to planning permission or that proposals are automatically unacceptable. I have found this proposal to be acceptable for the reasons that I have described.
10. The site is within the Walham Grove Conservation Area. The statutory duty in Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of a heritage asset is a matter of considerable importance and weight. In this case, I have found that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
11. I have also had regard to paragraph 197 of the Framework given the status of the site as a 'Building of Merit', but for the same reasons, have found that no harm would be caused to the non-designated heritage asset'.
12. Overall, I am satisfied that the appearance of the proposed roof lights would not cause harm to the appearance of the building or to the street scene and would be consistent with policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018 Key Principles of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018, which seek, amongst other requirements, to ensure that development is of a high quality and that heritage assets (including Buildings of Merit) are not harmed.

Conditions

13. I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is implemented within three years and that it is completed in accordance with the approved plans.
14. I have also imposed a condition requiring that details of the roof lights are submitted and approved by the local planning authority. This is because whilst they are annotated as being of a 'conservation' style on the drawings, given the heritage context, it is important that an appropriate design is selected and used. Given that planning permission is only being granted for the roof lights, it follows that such a condition would need to be addressed prior to the commencement of the development.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons that I have described, I consider that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

N Smith

INSPECTOR