



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3272707

6 Ethelden Road, London W12 7BG

- 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 and Mrs Ghoul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/00227/FUL, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof and proposed mansard loft extension to rear gable and outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The Council has indicated that the mansard loft extension to the rear gable and outrigger is acceptable, and on the basis of the evidence before me I have no reason to reach a contrary view. Accordingly, the main issues are the effect of the hip to gable roof extension on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the Ingersoll and Armingier Conservation Area and,
 - (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 4 Ethelden Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The host property is a two storey terraced property with a hipped roof located in a row of similarly designed dwellings in a prominent location at the corner of Ethelden Road with Armingier Road. It has bay windows at ground and first floor level and a two storey rear outrigger. Attached to the property and set back from the road is No 4 Ethelden Road, which is of a markedly different scale and form to the appeal property and visually does not form part of the uniform terrace to which the appeal property belongs. I have assessed the

proposal on the basis that the host property forms the end property in the terraced row.

5. The dwelling is sited within the Ingersoll and Arminger Conservation Area (CA) which is predominantly residential in character, comprising largely uniform Victorian terraced rows constructed of brick, with bay windows at ground and first floor level with corbels at the eaves and a mixture of slate and tiles on the roof, sited close to the back edge of the pavement beyond small enclosed front gardens. Consecutive properties are handed providing paired front doors and chimneys.
6. A further feature of the area is the differing roof designs at each end of the terraced row, with one end having a gable roof and the other having a hipped roof, with the end of each terrace row reflecting the roof design of its neighbouring terrace. The exception to this is the terrace comprising No 19 Ethelden Road and No 46 Arminger Road which has a hipped roof at each end.
7. Although the roof height and roofing materials of properties within the terrace of which the host property forms part are not consistent, the above features provide noticeable rhythm and symmetry to the streetscene.
8. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) also requires that great weight be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, which includes conservation areas.
9. Although the change in roof design proposed would reflect the opposite end of the terrace, in this context with the differing roof design at each end of the terraced row contributing to the symmetry of the area, it would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Taken with the increase in roof height, the proposal would result in a bulky addition which would be out of keeping with the architectural character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. Moreover, the proposed hip to gable extension would diminish the reprieve in the roof scape between Nos 6 and 4 and reduce the openness at roof level between the respective properties, which would be harmful to the appearance of this part of the conservation area.
11. I note that the Council has previously granted planning permission for an increase in height of the roof when it granted planning permission for the 2019¹ application, however in this case the roof retained the hipped design and even with the dormer proposed was of a significant lesser scale and prominence to the proposal before me.
12. Given the above, the contribution that the extended dwelling would make to the character and appearance of the area would be significantly reduced. The proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposed hip to gable roof extension conflicts with the townscape context and heritage assets aims of Policy DC1 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (HFLP), the scale, character and design objectives of HFLP Policy DC4 and the heritage and conservation aims of HFLP Policy DC8. This part of

¹ Ref 2019/03532/FUL

the proposal also conflicts with Key principle CAG3 of the Council's Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance in that it would not be sympathetic to the architectural character of the built context and would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the CA.

13. In terms of the harm that would be caused to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset, this would be less than substantial. In accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.
14. Whilst the proposal would increase the accommodation within the property, I have no evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal is necessary to secure the property's optimum viable use. Moreover, the increase in the size of the accommodation is a private, rather than a public benefit. The use of sensitive materials in the development would be expected of any well designed scheme and this matter does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
15. Accordingly, I find that there are no public benefits to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the CA and the proposal conflicts with the conserving and enhancing the historic environment objectives of the Framework.

Living conditions

16. No 4 Ethelden Road is set back 4 metres from the front of the host property. The outlook from the ground and first floor windows closest to the appeal property is largely down Arminger Road, although to the side, the tall flank wall of the appeal property is prominent.
17. Although the proposal would increase the height of the flank wall adjoining No 4, it would be unlikely to have a noticeable effect on the outlook from the front rooms of this property given the relationship of the proposal to the windows serving these rooms. The outlook down Arminger Road from No 4 would not be affected by the proposal. Moreover, the proposal would be unlikely to result in an increased sense of enclosure over and above the existing situation. The rooms that the front windows serve would be unlikely to be less pleasant places to use as a result of the new extension.
18. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 4 Ethelden Road and therefore accords with Policies DC1, DC4 and HO11 of the HFLP which seeks, amongst other matters for development to respect the principles of good neighbourliness.

Other Matters

19. Reference has been made to examples of other extensions in the locality, however these relate to a different context and in any event, limited detail has been provided of the circumstances that led to these developments being granted planning permission. Accordingly, I am unable to ascertain whether they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which I have assessed on its merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. Although the proposal would not result in harm in respect of the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4, this does not outweigh the substantial harm that would be caused in respect of the first main issue and the conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

21. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

22. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR