



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 September 2021

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3271093

2 Tyrawley Road, London SW6 4QQ

- 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 Tom Ralls against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/02790/FUL, dated 27 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 1.1 metre high ornate metal balustrade to the front elevation at second floor level above the existing bay window, in connection with the formation of a small balcony; replacement of existing window with door to the front elevation at second floor level, to provide access to the proposed balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 1.1 metre high ornate metal balustrade to the front elevation at second floor level above the existing bay window, in connection with the formation of a small balcony; replacement of existing window with door to the front elevation at second floor level, to provide access to the proposed balcony at 2 Tyrawley Road, London SW6 4QQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/02790/FUL, dated 28 October 2020, subject to the following 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: 01, 05, 06 and 07.
 - 3) 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Parson's Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within Parson's Green Conservation Area (the CA), its significance is in part derived from terrace housing and the parkland setting of Eel Brook Common. Tyrawley Road contains two storey terrace housing on both sides of the road. These have double height front bay windows where the majority have pitched and canted roofs over the bays. Small balconies are present at first floor level on top of each porch surrounded by decorative balustrading.
5. The terrace on the north side is shorter than that to the south with numbers 2 and 14 being the end houses. There is a mansard roof at the appeal property, which is a more recent addition. This has added greater bulk at roof level than there is at number 14 and has unbalanced the appearance of the terrace to a degree. These end terrace houses have a gable feature at roof level set above and behind the bays with arched fenestration. Despite the mansard at number 2, this has led to a differentiation replicated at each end of the terrace, effectively "bookending" it. This is an important characteristic of the street.
6. Number 1, opposite, and also an end terrace, has a similar gable feature but number 23 at the far end of the south terrace does not. That property has a mansard roof, which does not appear to be an original element of the house. It is possible that a gable feature was removed in the past. Number 1 also has a mansard roof which also may not be the original roof form.
7. Above the bay at number 14 there is no pitched roof. The flat roof is utilised as a small balcony with balustrading and access via arched topped doors in the gable feature. The balustrade is similar in design to that used above the porches along the terrace. Even if the balcony on the bay at number 14 was not granted planning permission it is now an established development and part of the character of the street. The appeal proposal seeks to provide a balcony on the top of the bay, with the pitched roof removed and doors provided in the gable in place of the existing window. It would essentially replicate the balcony and balustrade at number 14.
8. The development would result in a greater degree of continuity between the properties that bookend this terrace. In terms of detail and rhythm, the terrace would appear architecturally coherent. As the totality of the development, including the doors, would be seen in the context of the similar balcony at number 14, it would not draw attention to the mansard roof any more so than is currently the case.
9. The roofs over the bays are an important feature of the central dwellings in the terrace and any loss would degrade the character of the area. However, if the appeal scheme were to be implemented this would not indicate that similar alterations to the central terrace houses would be acceptable as they have a different character. Those dwellings also do not include an existing gable feature from which access to the roof of the bay could be provided.
10. The development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would accord with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (February 2018). Together these seek to ensure development creates a high quality urban environment which respects and enhances the townscape and heritage assets, that alterations successfully integrate into the architectural design of the existing building and that the significance of heritage

assets, including conservation areas, are conserved. There would also be no conflict with Key Principles CAG2 or CAG3 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document. These seek to ensure that new development contributes positively to the townscape and that appropriate account is taken of architectural detail and the conservation area so that alterations to buildings are sympathetic.

Conditions

11. Conditions relating to the implementation of the development and that it be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary in the interests of precision and clarity. Ensuring the materials used for the balustrade and new door match those used in the existing building is necessary to conserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would accord with the development plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR