
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/19/3239898
99C Stephendale Road, London SW6 2LT

- 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 Robert Johnston of Glenthorne Management Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/01977/FUL, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension to the front roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a top-floor flat in a terrace of similar properties in a predominantly residential area. The terrace on which the appeal property is located is a long terrace that extends almost unbroken to Wandsworth Bridge Road. This is unlike the opposite side of the street where smaller terraces are broken by roads running perpendicular to the road on which the appeal property is located.
4. The terrace on which the appeal property is located has a largely unaltered roofscape. On my site visit I observed that approximately only five other properties on this section of the terrace have any significant roof alterations. One of these is the property adjacent to the appeal site, however this is a corner property with a roof alteration that 'wraps' around the property. It is not directly comparable to the appeal property or the proposal subject to this appeal.
5. The proposed development would be highly visible to pedestrians and vehicular traffic on Stephendale Road and to pedestrians and vehicular traffic approaching Stephendale Road from Edenvale Street. Due to its scale, form and bulk, the proposed roof extension would unreasonably dominate the roofscape to the extent that the appearance of the property and the terrace would be harmed. It would appear excessive and prominent when viewed from the street.

6. Given that the overwhelming majority of properties on this section of the terrace do not have similar roof extensions to that proposed, the proposal would appear incongruous and out of character with the other properties on the terrace. It would disrupt what is, on the whole, a predominantly unaltered, harmonious roofscape. This is despite the site being located next to the corner property which has a mansard roof alteration.
7. Of the small number of existing roof extensions on this section of the terrace, some of those that I saw served to confirm that poorly designed roof extensions do harm the character and appearance of the area. Although I am not bound by previous planning decisions, the Council have also outlined that these are historic examples with the more recent planning history being to resist such alterations.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other roof extensions in the surrounding area, some of which are a notable distance from the appeal site. I do not find these examples directly comparable to the appeal site. The majority are on streets where there are significantly more roof alterations than the terrace on which the appeal site is located, and some are on shorter terraces. In any event, although I have had regard to these examples, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits.
9. The proposed roof extension would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018). Collectively, these policies require, amongst other things, that development is of high-quality design which should be compatible with the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to an erroneous reference in the Officer Report to the site being located within a conservation area. The Council's reason for refusal, and the main issue in this appeal, however, do not refer to any impact on a conservation area. I have determined the appeal on the basis that the site is not in a conservation area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR