



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 May 2021

by Scott Britnell MSc FdA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/20/3264471

Flat A First Floor, 75 Woodlawn Road, London SW6 6PS

- 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 Pascal Huser (Pascal Huser Design & Build) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/02287/FUL, dated 7 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'The works include the addition of a front mansard, including a dormer window and a roof light.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front roof extension and installation of a rooflight to the flat roof at main roof level at Flat A First Floor, 75 Woodlawn Road, London, SW6 6PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/02287/FUL, dated 7 September 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out on the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner header above has been taken from the application form. I have used the description used on the Council's decision notice in my formal decision, as I consider it to be more precise. I note that the appellant has used that same description on their appeal form and so I do not consider that any party would suffer any injustice by me referring to the proposal as such.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, the host terrace and the Crabtree Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, in making decisions on planning applications and appeals within a Conservation Area, special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area.
5. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight

- should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
6. The host building is an end of terrace property which sits at a right angle to the rear gardens of 40 – 48 Finlay Street. It has an attractive double height bay frontage with a gabled pediment above and a mix of materials, including brick, render and a slate roof. Planning permission has previously been granted for the erection of a rear roof extension; removal of part of the roof of the back addition to form a roof terrace with privacy screens at second floor level; installation of three rooflights in the front roof slope. These works appear to have been implemented.
 7. Woodlawn Road is a residential road in a built up area with the appeal site located on the edge of the CA. There are a number of roads that are bisected by Woodlawn Road so that the side and rear elevations of corner properties and their boundary treatments dominate the streetscene. A number of these properties have roof extensions and alterations which are clearly visible from Woodlawn Road. Where properties front Woodlawn Road, such as the appeal building, these are arranged in tightly packed terraces of similar appearance. I consider that the significance of the CA is derived, in part, from its attractive rows of terraced housing set out in a distinctive and orderly pattern of development.
 8. The proposal, as a result of its scale, form and location to the front of the host building would appear as a prominent addition. However, the rear of the building already benefits from a large roof extension, which has significantly altered its original appearance, the side elevation of which is visible from the public realm. The proposal, while resulting in additional bulk would bring a visual sense of symmetry and balance to the host building. It would have a simple form and would retain, albeit at a reduced depth, the pediment above the bay windows which contributes positively to the building's appearance. As such, while the proposal would result in a prominent change to the host building it would not result in harm to its character and appearance.
 9. The host terrace consists of seven properties, none of which have been altered by way of a front roof extension. There is, however, an adjacent terrace of a further seven dwellings separated by a small gap from the host terrace. The level of separation between the two terraces is such that they appear in views along Woodlawn Road as one continuous terrace.
 10. Two properties in the adjacent terrace have front roof extensions of different scale, form and design. These are located in close proximity to the appeal site and are prominent features in the locality, highly visible from the public realm. I do not have details of those extensions before me and I am mindful that each case must be considered on its own merits. However, given the context that I have set out above, the proposal would not appear incongruous or out of keeping with nearby development. The change that the proposal would bring about to the host terrace would not therefore be harmful.
 11. In addition to the examples that the appellant has referred me to, I observed that there are many properties in the CA that have front roof extensions, which vary in terms of their design, form, scale and materials. I acknowledge that the majority of these are located on adjacent roads to Woodlawn Road with no direct intervisibility with the appeal site. Further, I do not have the details of these developments before me. Nonetheless, the presence of these structures

and their prevalence within the CA contribute to its character and appearance. The proposal, therefore, would be compatible with other development in the CA. It would preserve its character and appearance and would cause no harm to its significance as a heritage asset.

12. I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the host building, the host terrace and the Crabtree Conservation Area. It would accord with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan February 2018. In summary, these require extensions to existing buildings to be compatible with the scale, and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting, and that all development within the borough should respect and enhance its townscape and conserve the significance of the boroughs historic environment by protecting its heritage assets. It would also comply with the overarching objectives of the Framework with regards to the historic environment and Key Principles CA G2 and CA G3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document February 2018.

Conditions

13. The Council have suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. In imposing conditions I have had regard to the relevant tests set out in the Framework, and where necessary to meet those tests or to provide clarification, I have revised the conditions accordingly.
14. In the interests of certainty I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans. To ensure that the development is completed in a manner sympathetic to the host building and the area, I have imposed conditions specifying the use of certain materials, including for the windows. A condition is also required, for the same reasons, to limit the projection of the parapet walls above the surface of the main roof structures.
15. The Council also request a condition that the materials to be used in any alteration to the elevations of the existing building shall be carried out in the same materials. It is unclear what alterations the Council are referring to and, as I am imposing conditions to control the materials to be used on the proposal, I have not imposed this condition.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Scott Britnell

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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:

EX.00 Review 01, TD.01 Review 02, TD.02 Review 02, TD.03 Review 02
3. The raised party walls of the front roof extension hereby approved shall be constructed in London stock brickwork.
4. The party walls of the front roof extension hereby approved shall not project more than 250 millimetres above or beyond the external faces of the main roof structures.
5. The front roof extension hereby approved shall be clad in slates or artificial slates.
6. The windows to the front elevation of the roof extension hereby approved shall be of timber frame construction and painted white.