

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/19/3232455
471 Fulham Palace Road, London SW6 6SU

- 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 Marmion against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/00479/FUL, dated 14 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of new roof addition to top floor apartment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider street-scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a long, unbroken terrace of attractive three-storey properties fronting onto Fulham Palace Road, with a park opposite, between the junctions of Fulham Palace Road with Fulham Road at one end and Lalor Street at the other. The original envelope of the terrace, visible in longer views from Fulham High Street has an attractive and consistent rhythm and form.
4. A number of the properties in the terrace, particularly towards Lalor Street have roof extensions similar to the appeal proposal, but some gaps remain. A substantial part of the terrace, from No 465 to No 489, which includes the appeal site has an unbroken run of un-extended roofs.
5. In the wider area and other streets, there are terraces which are characterised by having additional floors above the parapet, whether as originally built or subsequently extended. However, the character and appearance of this terrace on Fulham Palace Road is not in my view defined by such additions, and the extensions that have been built appear somewhat piecemeal.
6. I acknowledge that there are a number of these extensions within this terrace, but they are clustered towards the Lalor Street end, and as noted above, the appeal site itself lies within a relatively long run of so-far un-extended properties. As such, I consider that the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature in this section of the terrace, as it would be isolated and unrelated to its neighbours and would unbalance the appearance of this property within the terrace.

7. I note the comments of an Inspector in a decision for a similar development at No 445 Fulham Palace Road for a similar form of development quoted by the appellant. Although the part of the terrace to which that appeal relates does now have a number of such extensions, in my opinion they do not characterise the entire terrace encompassing the appeal site. As a result of the roof extensions that have taken place, I consider that the character of the terrace is split between that part in which properties have been extended, and that part in which they have not. I consider that the section of the terrace to which the appeal relates is currently characterised by, and is notable for, the lack of such extensions, and the appeal proposal would in fact therefore harm the uniformity of the section of terrace in which it sits.
8. I acknowledge the frustration of the appellant that the current approach of the Council to development of this type has allowed the extent of such extensions to gradually extend along the terrace. However, the roof extension proposed in this appeal would appear isolated and unrelated to the character and appearance of its immediate context. It would therefore give rise to an incongruous and somewhat unbalanced appearance, particularly given the general cohesion of this section of the terrace and its visibility in longer views.
9. I note that the proposed design, materials, finishes and detailing of the proposal is consistent with other extensions in this terrace. However, this does not outweigh my finding on the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the terrace and wider street-scene.
10. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider street-scene. As a result, it would be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development creates a high quality urban environment, respects and enhances the townscape context, reflects a high standard of design, and is compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and the setting to it.

Other Matters

11. The Bishops Park Conservation Area (CA) lies on the opposite side of Fulham Palace Road to the appeal site. Although I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider street-scene, I consider any effect on the significance of the CA would be neutral. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the separation from the CA, the nature of the setting, of the proposal and the great weight which should be given to the conservation of the significance of the CA.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR