



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3269793

9 Stanlake Villas, London W12 7EX

- 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 Benjamin Robertson & Nisa Berzeg against the decision of The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/03018/FUL, dated 17 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is Erection of roof extension with associated terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a short row of terraced houses on Stanlake Villas divided in two parts by Stanlake Road. The dwelling is an imposing end of terrace with a high roof parapet wall to the front that extends along the side of the dwelling. The terrace retains a significant amount of its original character.
4. The proposed roof extension would be set back from the front building line due to the position of the external terrace area. From street level towards the front, it would be largely screened from view by the high parapet wall and would not be clearly visible in views from the surrounding local area.
5. The property sits forward of the return dwelling on No 1 Stanlake Road, and the rear elevation of the appeal property is seen from both short and longer range views along Stanlake Road, despite the leafy tree cover within the area, which would not be present all year round. The appeal property draws the eye from this vantage as it is a large end of terrace house with the existing roof profile a striking feature. It is visually prominent on this corner location.
6. Turning to the effect of the proposal on the rear elevation, whilst the traditional butterfly roof would remain, the proposed extension would extend to just below the height of the chimney pots and fill the void across the full width of the property. Its overall scale would add considerable bulk and mass to the roof.

7. As the rear elevation of the appeal property is very exposed within the street scene, the proposal would appear as an excessively large and discordant extension. Further, the rear of the terrace as a set piece, is seen in more short-range views. The proposal would be at odds with the rear of the terrace where all other roofs here remains largely unaltered.
8. Even though the dwelling is not statutorily protected, and even with the use of traditional materials, I find that the proposal would not relate to local character as a sensitive addition to the property, the terrace, or the street scene when viewed from Stanlake Road. It would instead result in harm arising to the host dwelling and to the character and appearance of the street scene.
9. I have considered the examples of other roof extensions brought to my attention. However, I do not consider any of these directly compare to the circumstances of the appeal property before me. I therefore apply limited weight to these comparisons.
10. The external terrace may offer additional garden space for the occupants. At the time of my site visit I could see that part of the garden was in shade, although not all of it. However, I appreciate this occurred on one sunny May afternoon and I am aware of the photographic evidence presented of the garden space. All things considered, this limited information would not compel me to reach a favourable decision. Further, the garden is north facing to which the appellants would likely have had an awareness of before purchasing the property. Even though I have reached my findings, that is not to say that they could not pursue an external terrace separately to the extension, should they be minded to do so.
11. To conclude, given the scale and mass of the proposal, it would result in detrimental harm arising to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene contrary to the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018 Policies DC1 and DC4 in their combined design aims.

Other Matters

12. Whilst the scheme may lead to no harm arising to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and in other areas, an absence of harm is a neutral matter which weighs neither for nor against the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the street scene in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR