



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/19/3233716

**Maisonette First and Second Floors, 32 Mablethorpe Road,
London SW6 6AH**

- 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 Matt Thorley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/00673/FUL, dated 28 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing aluminium/painted timber windows on the first floor. Erection of a new annex to the rear of the second floor. Removal of existing windows on second floor and addition of a new Juliette balcony. Removal of skylights at front of hip roof and the addition of new skylights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It was noted during my site visit that there were discrepancies with the plans for this property. The plans failed to represent what was actually visible on site at the time. These inconsistencies were clear, and I was able to fully interpret the proposals for this property and any potential issues it would have on the host and neighbouring properties. Amended and updated plans have since been provided by the appellant and confirm what was visible on site at the time. I have determined the appeal on the basis of these plans and I am satisfied that no interested party has been prejudiced by my approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No 32 Mablethorpe Road (No 32) is situated in a residential tree-lined street, which consists of traditional terraced properties on both sides. This appeal concerns the flat which is situated on the first and second floors of this property. This flat has previously undergone a loft conversion to create a second floor.
5. When viewed from the rear of this and the neighbouring properties, traditional roofs, paired-back, 2-storey projections are noticeable. Many have now

undergone some form of modification, but the original character of the paired back projections and the relatively formal layout of the dwellings on the street remains apparent. Thus, whilst accepting some variation, the area to the rear of the appeal property has a prevailing traditional and formal residential character and appearance.

6. Nos 30 and 32 Mablethorpe Road have additional two-storey extensions beyond the two storey rear projections. No 32 has a flat roofed extension adjoining its existing rear projection. Some of the neighbouring properties to the rear, which are located on Bronsart Road, also have loft conversions and second floor extensions. Although these tended to be clad in slate which matched the existing rear roofscape.
7. This proposal would involve replacing the existing tiled pitch roof, with a flat-roofed, second-floor brick extension over the majority of the two-storey rear projection and the introduction of new terrace with modern glazed screening. Furthermore, the proposal would extend significantly beyond other properties nearby.
8. I acknowledge the proposal would only be visible from the properties immediately to the rear. Nevertheless, this does not justify a proposal which due to its size and conflicting form and finish would appear as a visually prominent and incongruous feature of the area noticeably at odds with the prevailing formal and traditional character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate surrounding area. It would consequently conflict with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) which require development to have a high standard of design and be compatible with the scale and character of the area.

Other Matters

10. The Council states that the development does not comply with the principles of good neighbourliness and protection of existing residential amenities. These are set out in the Supplementary Planning Document Key Principles HS7. However, this is not referenced in their reason for refusal. Furthermore, the Council's Delegated Report goes through these Key Principles in detail, but clearly found that the proposal complied with each of the principles. I agree that the proposal meets the Key Principles and therefore consider that it would have no detrimental impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
11. I have taken into account representations concerning structural implications. However, I consider this matter would be controlled through Building Regulations.
12. My attention has been drawn to other schemes visible from No 32. However, it is evident that they are all to the rear of Bronsart Road and not Mablethorpe Road. Additionally, these developments do not comprise of a combination of a prominent second floor extension and a roof terrace.
13. I have also had regard to the appellant's statement pointing out that planning permission and appeals have been allowed for a variety of extensions in the Hammersmith & Fulham Borough. However, these were not visible from this site or within the immediate vicinity. I am also not aware of the particular

circumstances of any of these cases. Furthermore, their existence does not justify the further harm to the area that I have found would occur if the appeal development were to be allowed.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons detailed above I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hilton-Brown

INSPECTOR