



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/21/3279507

61, 63, 65, 67 and 71 Lysia Street, London, SW6 6NF

- 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 Graham Chappell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/00901/FUL, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is double mansard loft conversion for houses Nos 61, 63, 65, 67 & 69 Lysia Street.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of the development above, which is taken from the planning application form, a more precise description of the proposal and the properties it relates to is that provided in the decision notice, and which the appellant has confirmed in the appeal form, as 'erection of front roof extensions to property Nos 61, 63, 65, 67 and 71 Lysia Street'. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crabtree Conservation Area (the CCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the CCA, whose significance is largely derived from the grid pattern of terraced properties which have similar characteristics and are typically laid out in groups of six. The largely consistent roof line and form of most groups of properties along the immediate stretch of Lysia Street is a key characteristic which contributes to the traditional appearance and regular rhythm of the streetscape. The appeal properties form 5 out of 6 dwellings within a group and have limited front roof alterations and a uniform appearance. Accordingly, they make a positive contribution to the CCA.
5. Although the proposed roof extensions may reflect the materials and fenestration of the host properties, they would nevertheless result in a considerable increase of massing which would be readily apparent and visually prominent from the public realm. As No 69 is not included within the proposed development, No 71 would be isolated from the group of altered roof forms and therefore lack a harmonious relationship with neighbouring properties within its

group. By virtue of these factors, the proposed roof extensions would significantly detract from the simple and traditional appearance of the host properties and would interrupt the consistent roof line and form of the terraced group. It would therefore undermine the integrity of the group and erode its uniformity with and positive contribution to the immediate street scene.

6. I acknowledge there are other examples of front roof extensions along Lysia Street. I have been provided with plans and the planning decision notice for the example at No 25 and I acknowledge that the planning policy context at the time of that approval may have been similar to the existing context. However, as I do not know the full circumstances under which it and other examples along Lysia Street have been constructed, a direct and fully reasoned comparison is not possible. Moreover, the number of examples is very limited compared to the total number of properties on Lysia Street. They do not therefore significantly detract from the predominantly strong degree of uniformity in the street scene and thus do not justify the appeal proposal.
7. The referenced approval on Friston Street relates to front mansard extensions to a group of 6 properties, adjacent to an existing front mansard extension and in a short street and terrace of 9 properties. It seems to me that this approval attempts to address the already interrupted roofline of the street and evolving street scene in a comprehensive manner. Similarly, other streets within the CCA are dominated by a large number of front roof alterations thus their integrity and consistency has also already been significantly undermined. This is unlike the appeal proposal which would interrupt and appear at odds with the predominantly consistent roof form of properties on Lysia Street.
8. Given the scale of the development in context, the harm it causes to the significance of the CCA is less than substantial. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that irrespective of the level of harm, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and, where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I have not been made aware of any such benefits.
9. Accordingly, the proposed development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CCA and it conflicts with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (February 2018), Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (February 2018) and the Framework. Collectively, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that developments are compatible with and respect their context and conserve or enhance heritage assets.

Conclusion

10. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, and for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR