



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2021

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MAUD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/20/3257689

191 Munster Road, London, SW6 6BY

- 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 Howard Benjamin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/00213/FUL, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an additional floor at roof level to provide a self-contained flat.
-

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 Central Fulham Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The site forms part of a four-storey terrace of buildings on the corner of Munster Road and Wyfold Road. The former contains a mix of building heights and styles with a commercial parade stretching to the north, with the latter more residential in nature, with buildings occupying longer frontages than on Munster Road.
4. The proposed fourth-storey flat would be set back from the Munster Road (front) elevation, which would limit its visibility from the northern approach due to the existing bulk of the terrace. Despite a shorter setback on the Wyfold Road (side) elevation, it would be visible from the southern approach, as well as the approach along Wyfold Road, which is outside the Conservation Area, and the approach along St Olaf's Road, which is within.
5. The appeal building is noticeable within the street scene due to its height and individual appearance amongst the other buildings in the area. It has symmetrical proportions and appears unusually bulky compared with these, together with moulded parapet walls at roof level. Despite its subordinate proportions, the extension would unbalance the symmetry and add a disparate new element to the roof, which would be particularly visible from the west, south and east and draw the eye, thereby appearing incongruous and obtrusive.

6. An assessment of the Conservation Area's heritage significance was not provided by the Council. In my view, the appeal building contributes to the significance through its solidity and regular proportions in contrast to much of the Munster Road street scene. Further significance of the wider Conservation Area is derived from the age of its buildings and their retained features. In this context, together with the aforementioned concerns, the addition of a modern element to the appeal building would further detract from its appearance.
7. During my visit, I saw that there were numerous roof extensions on other properties in the area. Many of these are outside the boundary of the Conservation Area. Owing to the aforementioned building variations, I cannot make a direct comparison between these other examples and the appeal proposal. In any instance, they do not mitigate my concerns.
8. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 196 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (2019) requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I appreciate that the provision of an additional housing unit would provide additional accommodation in an area of high demand, but the overall gain is minor and insufficient to outweigh the harm.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and would conflict with the *Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan* (February 2018), which is the Council's Development Plan for the area. Specifically, there would be conflict with Local Plan Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8, which together require development to respect and enhance its townscape context and heritage assets and be compatible with the scale and character of its host building and surroundings, amongst other considerations. There are no material considerations to indicate that I should determine the appeal other than in accordance with the Development Plan for the area.

Conclusion

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

G Rollings

INSPECTOR