
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/19/3231721

86 Bloemfontein Road, London W12 7DB

- 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 R Moore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/00782/FUL, dated 12 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed roof extension following rear dormer and front roof slope window to comply conservation area type'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development has been altered on the decision notice to read 'Erection of a rear roof extension; and installation of a rooflight in the front roofslope'. This more clearly describes the development proposed and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the front rooflight and rear dormer window on the character and appearance of the Old Oak and Wormholt Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Old Oak and Wormholt Conservation Area (the conservation area) on the Western side of Bloemfontein Road, to the north of Bryony Road is largely comprised of groups of terraced dwellings. The simple cohesive form and largely undisturbed roof-slopes of these dwellings are defining features of the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.
5. Whilst the rooflight would be of conservation style, with limited projection from the front roof-slope, it would appear at odds with the appearance of the terrace which has an undisturbed front roof slope that provides it with solidity and a cohesive form, despite the slight limited loss of uniformity which has occurred in the front elevations over time.
6. The prominence of the rooflight would be increased due to its lack of alignment with the windows below on the front elevation and because it would have a rectangular appearance that would be at odds with the fenestration below which has a vertical emphasis. Consequently, it would form a visually obtrusive addition which would be widely visible from Bloemfontein Road.

7. Whilst the rear roof extension would be set in from the edges of the roof-slope, set up from the eaves and set down from the ridgeline, it would remain a large and overly bulky feature which would cover most of the rear roof-slope. It would subsequently appear significantly at odds with the appearance of the terrace which has an undisturbed rear roof slope. The use of materials to match those existing would not provide adequate mitigation against these issues. Consequently, it would also form a visually obtrusive addition. The rear roof-slope is visible from the Fitness Centre and Swimming Pool car park to the west and consequently the roof extension would be visible to many.
8. Both the rooflight and the rear roof extension would therefore detract from the appearance of the terrace. Subsequently, they would detract from the heritage significance of the conservation area which lies in part with the simple cohesive form and largely undisturbed roof slopes of these terraced dwellings.
9. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
10. The benefits of the appeal scheme would be limited to the provision of increased living space at the appeal property. However, any such benefit would primarily be a personal one for the appellant. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise, which would be visible to many and the statutory protection afforded to conservation areas, such benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh this harm.
11. Consequently, the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) which seek high quality development appropriate to local character and the protection of heritage assets. It would also be contrary to guidance within key principle CAG3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which requires that development be appropriate to the character of conservation areas.

Other Matters

12. My attention has been drawn to a similar development at 116 Bloemfontein Road. However, the evidence indicates that this scheme was approved a significant number of years ago. Further, I have not been made aware of any planning guidance that was in place at the time or of circumstances under which such development was found to be acceptable. I cannot therefore afford this matter any significant weight. In any event, each case should be considered on its own merits. It is accepted that the proposal would not have any significant impact on the living conditions of other nearby occupiers, although this is a neutral factor.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR