



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3269239

22 Gowan Avenue, London SW6 6RF

- 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 David Golding against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/03044/FUL, dated 19 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the addition of front roof extension including 2 dormer windows.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The Council has used the following description "erection of front roof extension" and this is as set out in the appellant's appeal form. This more accurately describes the proposal and is used below.
2. The updated National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on the 20 July 2021. I have referred to this where relevant.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of front roof extension at 22 Gowan Avenue, London SW6 6RF, in accordance with the terms of application ref: 2020/03044/FUL, dated 19 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: TD.00 Rev.1 (Location plan); EX.01 Rev.1 (Existing front roof structure); TD.01 Rev.1 (Proposed front roof structure).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a terraced Victorian property within a residential street of similar properties. The properties within the immediate context of the appeal site have a pleasant uniform appearance with recessed front doors under open porches with small balcony above and square bay windows to ground and first floor with feature 'dutch' gable above with small pitched roof behind. Externally the properties have either render or brick elevations.
6. The proposal involves a roof extension comprising a slate clad mansard style roof addition with front windows and new party wall to both sides. It would be sited behind the front 'dutch' gable thus retaining this important feature of the terrace which is one of the main elements contributing to the character and uniformity of the terrace.
7. A number of other nearby properties have had similar roof additions including at numbers 16 and 28 within the immediate terrace of the appeal site, as well as at numbers 19, 21 and 23 directly opposite the site. As such, these roof additions are essentially a part of the established character of the immediate street scene of the appeal site. I note that this was the finding of Inspectors at recent appeals relating to similar roof additions to other properties in the street and in respect of applications considered by the Council as referred to by the appellant. I see no reason to come to a different conclusion here.
8. In any event I consider that the proposed roof extension would appear as a complementary and proportionate addition to the appeal property and, as other existing roof extensions have done, would blend in well with the character and appearance of the terrace. In this context, I do not consider that it would appear as an intrusive or unsympathetic addition as suggested by the Council.
9. Therefore, I find that, there is no conflict with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which require development to create a high quality urban environment that respects and enhances townscape context and is compatible with the scale and character of existing development and successfully integrated into the architectural design of the existing building having regard to such factors as scale, form, mass and proportion. I also find that it would accord with the Council's Planning Guidance SPD to which I have been referred and insofar as it is relevant.
10. In respect of the Framework, I find that the proposal would accord with its aim to achieve well designed places, in particular paragraph 130 which seeks development that adds to the overall quality of the area and is visually attractive.

Conclusions

11. Overall, for the reasons set out, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed. Conditions to refer to the approved plans and to require matching materials are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory visual appearance.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR