



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2021

**by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 04 March 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/20/3261186**  
**19 Henchman Street, London, W12 0BW**

- 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 Milad Makar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
  - The application 2020/01846/FUL, dated 20 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
  - The development proposed is erection of a rear roof extension to include 2 no. dormer windows on the rear roof slope; and installation of 2 no. rooflights in the front roof slope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have used the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this more accurately describes the alterations and extensions proposed to the roof, rather than just describing it as a loft conversion.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Old Oak and Wormholt Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end house in an L shaped terrace that sits behind a communal grassed area on a bend in the road. It is located within the Old Oak & Wormholt Conservation Area.
5. The CA comprises residential estates which according to the Council were built between the years 1912 and 1928 with a 'cottage style' and garden suburb character. The appellant has provided an extract of a description of the terrace within which the appeal property is located, taken from a character profile of the CA.
6. Although the roof of No 19 is not referred to specifically in the character profile, roofscapes within the CA are an important feature of it and contribute significantly to its character. The extract refers to hipped gable roofs over bays as a distinctive feature. In my view, these break up roofscapes in the area and

draw attention to them, as do large brick chimney stacks and the generally uniform roof materials. Also, the ridge height relative to the eaves on some terraces provide an expansive roof slope and relatively steep pitch which further draw attention to the area's roofscape.

7. The appellant has provided examples of rooflights in the area, and the neighbouring property has a rear roof dormer extension. However, I saw no examples of two dormers within the same roof plane, above eaves level, and few roofs with two roof lights on the front elevation. Such alterations and extensions do not therefore appear to be common and are consequently conspicuous in an otherwise relatively unaltered roofscape, not just within the immediate terrace but also the wider CA. The proposed rooflights and rear roof dormers would interrupt this relatively undeveloped roofscape and as such harm the appearance of a feature that I have identified as contributing to the character of the CA. As a result, the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
8. The position of the appeal site is relatively discrete. It is set back from the road and at the end of a terrace backing on to a treelined railway embankment. As a result, the alterations and extensions would be visible from limited viewpoints. Whilst the harm would therefore be localised, limited, and less than substantial it would nevertheless be contrary to policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which seek good design that is compatible with the scale and character of existing development and conserves the significance of the borough's historic environment.
9. Furthermore, the proposed development would be contrary to key principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which requires new development to contribute positively to the townscape and visual quality of the area and be sympathetic to a building's architectural character, including its roof form.
10. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires justification and, in accordance with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. Although no public benefits have been put forward by the appellant, there would be modest benefits arising from short term employment during its construction. However, such benefits would not outweigh the harm to the appearance of the CA.

### **Other Matters**

11. A third party representation raised concerns regarding similar proposals having been refused, fly tipping, the conversion of houses to flats within the area and the potential for the proposed development to create a precedent. However, these do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

### **Conclusion**

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

*P D Sedgwick*

INSPECTOR