



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3279972

10 Hopgood Street, London W12 7JU

- 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 Rea Zhubi against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/00974/FUL, dated 24 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a mansard extension. Erection of a three-storey rear extension above the existing rear extension, between the upper ground and new third floor to create an additional 3 bathrooms off the hall landings'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a mansard extension. Erection of a three-storey rear extension above the existing rear extension, between the upper ground and new third floor to create an additional 3 bathrooms off the hall landings, at 10 Hopgood Street, London, W12 7JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/00974/FUL, dated 24 March 2021, 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 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 approved plans: SKU_2062_P_SK10 (Rev C), SKU_2062_P_SK11 (Rev D) and SKU_2062_P_SK12 (Rev C).

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council's determination of the appeal planning application, consent has been granted for a similar proposal which excludes the third-floor rear extension. Nonetheless I am required to consider the proposal before me.

Main Issues

3. These are the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a first and second floor terraced maisonette. The erection of an additional floor at roof level is similar to a number of mansard roof schemes approved for the terrace, including the recent appeal decision

APP/H5390/D/20/3249889 relating to No 8. The bulk and massing of the proposed mansard roof would sit comfortably within the roof context and the Council raises no objections to this element of the proposal. There are no reasons to reach a different conclusion.

5. The Council's objection to the appeal proposal relates to the third-floor level of the back addition. I have had particular regard to the view of the proposed development from MacFarlane Road. The host building is set well away from that road and would be largely concealed from view by surrounding buildings. The rear additions from the first to third floor levels would be modest and would not overly dominate the rear elevation. I conclude that the proposed development would be a sufficiently subservient and visually acceptable addition to the host property and would not harm its character and appearance, nor that of the terrace or the wider area.
6. The appeal site is outside the boundary of the Shepherds Bush Conservation Area. The appeal proposal would have no adverse impact on the setting of the conservation area and would not harm its significance.
7. For the foregoing reasons, the proposal would comply with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which require development to be subservient and to respect the character and appearance of the parent building and to respect their surroundings. It would also be consistent with the design guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

8. In respect of other matters raised, there is already extensive overlooking between properties in the locality. The proposed development would not increase this to an unacceptable degree. The structural integrity of the host building as a result of the proposed development would be controlled by other legislation. Noise, disturbance and vehicle movements during construction would be temporary and do not affect my decision. Enforcement matters relating to nearby properties are not material to this appeal. The Council has raised no objections to the proposal on these grounds and there are no justifiable reasons to disagree.

Conditions

9. In the interests of certainty and proper planning I have identified details of the approved plans in a condition. A further condition is necessary requiring the use of matching external materials to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR