
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2020

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/20/3249889

8 Hopgood Street, London W12 7JU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Alex Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/03267/FUL, is dated 1 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a mansard extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a mansard extension at 8 Hopgood Street, London W12 7JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/03267/FUL, dated 1 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1590 06, 1590 07, 1590 08, 1590 09, 1590 10.

3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling.

4) No water tank, lift motor room, or other structure or appliance shall be erected upon the roof of the extension hereby permitted.

5) No plumbing, extract flues or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, may be fixed on the front elevation of the building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has not indicated, had it been in a position to determine the application, whether planning permission would have been granted for the proposed development. Furthermore, it has not submitted an appeal statement or a list of suggested conditions. The appeal questionnaire has directed me to relevant policies within the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018 (LP) and I shall deal with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal site relates to a mid-terrace property on Hopgood Street, just off the busy Uxbridge Road in Shepherd's Bush. The surrounding area is a mixture of uses, with dwellings prevailing on Hopgood Street and commercial premises on Uxbridge Road.
5. Given the degree of mutual overlooking between dwellings in the locale, the proposed roof extension would not result in a loss of privacy above and beyond that which already occurs. The size and scale of the proposal would ensure that there will be no significant loss of light, outlook or overbearing impact to neighbouring residents as a result of the development.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties. It would thus accord with policies DC4 and HO11 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018 (LP) and Key Principle HS7 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD), which seek to ensure that development protects the amenity and living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. It would meet the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure safe and healthy living conditions.

Character and appearance

7. The proposed mansard extension would be constructed with brickwork, hung slate tiles and a felt flat roof. The dormer windows are to be painted timber. I consider that the proposal as a whole is of appropriate design and would sit comfortably on the roof without appearing overly dominant.
8. Although the appeal site is not within the nearby Shepherd's Bush Conservation Area (SBCA), I have considered the effect of the proposal on views into and out of it. To my mind, the impact on the architectural or historical interest of the SBCA is likely to be minimal as a result of the development.
9. I conclude that the scheme would not cause an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would meet policies DC1, DC4 and HO11 of the LP and Key Principles HS3 and HS6 of the SPD, which require development to enhance the local environment, prevent visual intrusion and reflect the character of the area. It would also be consistent with the Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the

standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. Conditions concerning the submission of external materials; and those preventing structures and appliances on the roof and plumbing on the front elevation would ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

11. Based on my findings above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR