

---

# 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/21/3274387**

**33 Epple Road, London SW6 4DJ**

- 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 Edward Green against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
  - The application Ref 2021/00192/FUL, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a front and rear roof extension, involving the installation of new dormer windows and a 250mm increase in ridge height.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this 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 this matter, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

## Main Issue

3. Planning permission has been granted at the site for the erection of a rear roof extension involving the installation of a rear dormer window and a 250mm increase in the ridge height. The appeal development is similar to this approved scheme in terms of the ridge height and the rear roof extension. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the front roof extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

## Reasons

4. Epple Road consists of terrace houses on both sides of the road. The dwellings vary in architectural detailing, but these are set in groups of houses that share a similar appearance. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house and the second within one of these groups of houses. They are two storey and have pitched roofs. There is a gable feature, with decorative painted stone detailing at roof level set above the double height bay windows on each of the houses in this group.

5. The groups of properties in the south eastern end of the road, on both sides, have a more modest appearance. The group opposite the appeal site also have a gable feature, but different in the detailed design. These dwellings have mansard roofs, and they appear notably of a greater scale than the group within which the appeal dwelling is located and the more modest houses to the south east. The different detailed design and scale of the dwellings, but with the uniformity within each group is an important characteristic of this street.
6. The proposal includes a front extension which would result in a mansard style roof form incorporating three windows. The existing gable features on the appeal dwelling and its neighbours would result in the prominence of the roof extension being reduced to a degree. It would however still remain notable when approaching the property from either direction. There would be greater bulk at roof level which would increase the overall scale of the dwelling. This would significantly erode the uniformity of the group of dwellings within which the appeal property is located. It would undermine the important characteristic of the area with a cohesive scale and appearance within each distinct group of dwellings. The use of matching materials would not mitigate the impact of this sufficiently.
7. The presence of mansard roofs on the group of dwellings opposite does not indicate that a front roof extension would be acceptable on the appeal dwelling. Rather this emphasises the importance of the differentiation between the groups but uniformity within them. There have been alterations to the roofs of some of the properties within the street through the provision of rooflights. These however are a modest form of development and they do not affect uniformity to the degree the appeal scheme would. The site is not located within a conservation area nor is it a listed building. However, it remains necessary to consider the effect of the front roof extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area. For the above reasons there would be harm in this respect.
8. Permission has been granted, at appeal, for a front roof extension at 28 Gowan Road. That dwelling, and its neighbours, have gable features above the bay similar to the appeal site. However, unlike at the appeal site, there were a number of pre-existing mansard roof extensions on the terrace. At the date of the site visit it also appeared that a number of others were under construction. Therefore, a different context and considerations were relevant in that case. It does not indicate that the appeal scheme is acceptable. Other examples of front roof extensions in Parson's Green, Elmstone Road and Harbledown Road have been referred to. Full details of those developments have not been provided and while, close to the appeal site, they do not share intervisibility with it. This appeal scheme has to be considered on its own merits.
9. The front roof extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and area. It would be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC4 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 that alterations and extensions are compatible with the character of existing and neighbouring development. It would not accord with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which seek to ensure good design is delivered and that development responds to the sites context. There would also be conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

## **Conclusion**

10. The front roof extension would not have any undue impact in terms of the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. This is a neutral matter, and it does not mitigate or outweigh the harm that would arise. The front roof extension would not accord with the development plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR