



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/19/3238455

92 Kenyon Street, London SW6 6LB

- 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 Miss Louisa Penn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/01743/FUL, dated 6 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of front roof extension; including new Velux rooflight and dormer windows. New traditional sash dormer windows of timber construction, with matching window detailing as required. New flat roof to maximise natural light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA) with particular regard to the front roof extension.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling, which is in a terrace of eight similarly designed dwellings. Most of the dwellings in the terrace have converted the existing roof space and have roof lights with the original roof plane being well preserved.
4. The appeal property is in the Crabtree CA, a designated heritage asset. The CA is characterised by its residential and rectilinear street pattern, with low, genteel residential terraces consisting of a mixture of houses and two-storey flats. The properties in this terrace have bay windows and gables with uniform pitched roofs which are important features in defining the rhythm of the street providing relief to the facades. The appeal property is an attractive dwelling, making a positive contribution to the special character of the CA.
5. The appeal proposal is for the extension of the roof, incorporating two new windows to the front roof, which would provide additional residential accommodation. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance, Planning Document (SPD) (2018) contains several Key Principles. In particular, Key Principle – CAG3 'New Development in Conservation Areas' states that extensions and alterations should be sympathetic to the architectural character

- of the built context and should not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the CA. It also states that the front roof slopes are unacceptable where they harm the uniformity of a terrace or the proportions of a building.
6. By way of contrast, the appeal proposal would unacceptably introduce a different roof form to that which prevails along this well-preserved terrace of eight dwellings. The front roof slope, having the appearance of a mansard roof style addition, would have a much steeper pitch than the neighbouring dwellings and would also introduce two dormer style windows, which project forward of the roof plane. It would also introduce a parapet wall which would look discordant when viewed obliquely from the street. Together, the additions would make the roof more dominant in the street scene and would introduce inharmonious features that would uncharacteristically interrupt the uniform character of the original roofline of the terrace, causing harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
 7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other roof extensions, which have been constructed along Kenyon Street, Inglethorpe Street, Langthorne Street and Finlay Street. I saw that some of these other schemes do not follow the design approach specified in the SPD and they do not provide a basis for justifying similar proposals, which would equally fail to adopt good design principles. I have also had regard to the appeal decision¹ referred to by the Council. In any event, I have determined the appeal proposal in terms of its own planning merits.
 8. I am also mindful that the proposal would be constructed in materials that match the existing building and that it would provide improved accommodation for the occupiers. I have also had regard to the size and position of the existing street tree. I also note that there are letters of support from some of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. However, none of these matters either alter or outweigh the harm identified to the CA.
 9. The appeal proposal, by reason of its detailed design, size and bulk would result in an obtrusive and incompatible form of development, poorly related to and at odds with the established and historic pattern of development in this terrace. The statutory duty in Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This weighs considerably against the proposal.
 10. The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in 'less than substantial' harm under paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
 11. The Framework requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal is for a front roof extension which would provide a very modest contribution to the housing stock. The public benefits would not outweigh the less than substantial harm.
 12. It would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and therefore conflicts with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and Key Principles CAG2 and

¹ APP/H5390/D/13/2202569

CAG3 of the SPD which require, amongst other things, development to create high quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context and heritage assets.

Other matters

13. I am mindful that a local resident has raised concerns regarding noise from any construction activity. As I have found the proposal to be unacceptable for other reasons, it is not necessary for this decision to address this concern any further.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR