
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019 by AJ Sutton BA Hons DipTP DMS MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/19/3233323

3 Trevanion Road, London, Hammersmith & Fulham W14 9BJ

- 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 & Mrs Lo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/00976/FUL, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of a roof extension at roof level to provide additional floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Works appear to have commenced on the scheme at the time the site visit was conducted.
4. The Council refers to Key Principle CAG3 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) in the decision notice. However, a copy has not been provided and this decision is limited to the information before me.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area which is a designated heritage asset.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is mid-terrace in a short block of three-storey, flat roofed dwellings located on Trevanion Road, in a residential area. The block is a relatively modern addition to an area which generally comprises grand three and four storey terraced properties dating from the late 19th Century/early 20th Century period. It forms the base of a triangular street pattern, flanked by

Gunterstone Road and Gwendwr Road, with the central area formed by the publicly accessible Gwendwr Gardens. It is within the Gunter Estate Conservation Area (GECA).

7. The proposed development is for the erection of an additional floor on the flat roof space of the appeal property.
8. The host property and terrace of which it forms part is of a uniform design, for the most part, establishing a rhythm to both the street and roofscapes. The proposal would introduce a large, bulky addition on the roof which would significantly disrupt the rhythm of the roofscape and detract from the appearance of the host property and the terrace of which it forms part. It would be viewed as an unsympathetic addition, the fenestration and balustrading of which would draw attention to this incongruous feature upon the roof.
9. I am mindful that there are roof extensions at Nos 8 and 9 at the end of the terrace. However, they are smaller than the appeal proposal and appear to have been constructed many years ago. They are viewed in a different context and are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. As such, they do not provide justification for the appeal proposal.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, which in this case is the GECA, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
11. Given the harm that I have identified above, it follows that the contribution that the host property and terrace of which it forms part make to the character and appearance of the area would be diminished. In this regard the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CECA. It would not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
12. Whilst the harm to the significance of the GECA would be less than substantial, paragraph 196 of the Framework clarifies that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Although I acknowledge the appellants' desire to provide additional accommodation to their property, this does not amount to a public benefit which outweighs the harm to the significance of the heritage asset.
13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the host property and the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the CECA, contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan 2018, which collectively require development to respect and enhance its townscape context, be of a high standard of design compatible with the scale and character of the existing development and its setting and conserve or enhance heritage assets. In reaching this conclusion I acknowledge that no objections were received from nearby occupiers to the planning application, however this matter carries neutral weight in my consideration and does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons outlined above, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR