The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3271171
Site Address 90 Shorrolds Road, London SW6 7TX

- 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 Ms Hetherington against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council.
- The application Ref 2020/02597/FUL, dated 9 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2020.
- The development proposed is the erection of a front roof extension with 2no. windows at main roof level; installation of French doors to replace the existing window and erection of railings around the flat roof at second floor level to the rear elevation in connection with its use as a terrace.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development, as provided on the application form, does not include the proposed roof terrace. Therefore, in the interests of completeness, the encompassing description, as provided by the Council on the decision notice, has been used.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of:

    - the proposed front roof extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
    - the proposed rear roof terrace on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, with regard to overlooking; and
    - the proposed rear roof terrace on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Shorrolds Road is a tree-lined residential street with two and three-storey Victorian terraces on either side. The appeal site sits within a row of eight two-storey terraces with pitched roofs and bay windows. The proposal seeks to

erect a front roof extension with two windows and to install French doors leading to a newly introduced roof terrace at second floor level, to the rear of the property.

Character and Appearance (Front Roof Extension)

6. The roofline along Shorrolds Road, and specifically in the section of the appeal site, remains largely without significant alterations. Pitched roofs are an intrinsic part of the character of the area. The proposed roof extension, by virtue of its mass and design, would be a dominant addition that would undermine the original roofline and detract from the front roof profile. The existing roofscape is harmonious, with the exception of No. 86 Shorrolds Road, which unbalances the defined pattern. The proposed development would further emphasise this imbalance.

7. No. 86 Shorrolds Road is the only example of a roof extension within the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, the extension at No.86 is historic, it appears as an outlier and is out of keeping with the established character of the area. It only serves to demonstrate the harmful impact of such a front roof extension in this particular context. Adding a further extension would simply erode important elements of the character and appearance of the area. Although other nearby examples have been provided by the appellant, the appeal site has been considered in its relevant context with other properties in this section of Shorrolds Road.

8. For the reasons given above the proposed front roof extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to accord with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (HFLP), adopted 2018. Together, these Policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality and responds well to its surroundings. The Council have included Policy HO11 in their reason for refusal, however, as this Policy deals with living conditions it is not considered to be relevant to this main issue.

Living Conditions (Roof Terrace)

9. The area to the rear of the appeal site has a degree of overlooking as part of its character, with Mirabel Road and Fabian Road running perpendicular and those properties facing in toward each other. Due to this nature the proposed roof terrace would extend views into the rear gardens and windows of neighbouring properties to a greater extent than is currently the case. Specific concern has been raised about the bathroom window of 92 Shorrolds Road and on the site visit it was noted that the living conditions of occupants at 2 Mirabel Road would also be impacted by overlooking.

10. The plans do not propose any visibility screening and, due to the positioning of the roof terrace and its relationship with the neighbouring properties, it would be difficult to ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupants would be protected. Therefore, the proposed development would be detrimental to the living conditions of these occupants.

11. For the reasons given above the proposed roof terrace would result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties. It would contravene Policy HO11 of the HFLP, which encourages good neighbourliness through the protection of residential amenity and privacy. Furthermore, the development would not comply with the aspects of Policy DC4 of the HFLP that also promote

good neighbourliness. Additionally, the development would not comply with Key Principle HS8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 2018. This Key Principle seeks to ensure that residential amenity is protected, specifically within the context of overlooking from balconies and terraces.

Character and Appearance (Roof Terrace)

12. On the site visit it was observed through a rear window of the appeal site that many properties within the visible vicinity, including some neighbouring, have roof terraces of a similar design. Although the proposed roof terrace would be visible from very small parts of the public domain it would not appear prominent or out of context with the surrounding area. Many nearby examples can be seen more prominently than the appeal site between houses on both Mirabel Road and Fabian Road. Though some other nearby examples may not benefit from planning permission, it is apparent that roof terraces are characteristic of the area. The proposed design would be in keeping with other terraces and continue the pattern of development.

13. For the reasons given above, the roof terrace would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the HFLP, adopted 2018. Together, these policies ensure that development is of a high quality and responds well to its surroundings. The Council have included Policy HO11 in their reason for refusal, however, as this Policy deals with living conditions it is not considered to be relevant to this main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Overall, although the roof terrace would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, this is a neutral matter and does not mitigate harm that would be caused by other parts of the development. Although the development would provide additional space, both internally and externally, for the occupants, this would not outweigh the harm that has been found. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR