



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2022

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3283764

45 Sullivan Road, London SW6 3DT

- 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 Samy Hamdan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/01951/FUL, dated 14 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Front roof extension by enlarging the bay projection (in connection with approved application ref. num. 2020/03277/FUL) Installation of a new front window to the front roof extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hurlingham Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace property in a row of four dwellings situated just beyond a curve in the residential street of Sullivan Road, in the Hurlingham Conservation Area (CA). While no CA Appraisal has been provided, the immediate section is defined by a largely consistent rhythm and sequence of development.
4. Despite a variety of property types in the street, and evidence of alterations along the front elevations, the dwellings on the appeal site side of Sullivan Road share an overall level of consistency in design. The original style and proportions of dwellings remaining evident among later additions, which are primarily front dormer extensions. This is particularly the case for the group to which the appeal property belongs, which also have gable features of uniform height. In respecting this sequence of development, the property contributes positively to the area.
5. The Council has concluded that the rear roof extension element of the proposal would be acceptable. In addition, due to the prevalence of front dormers in the street, and in the group of dwellings to which the appeal property belongs, the Council have also found this element of the proposal

would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or surrounds. Based on my observations, I have no reason to disagree.

6. The issue therefore lies with the proposed alteration to the front gable element. While it would be constructed from materials to match the remainder of the dwelling, it would raise the gable feature beyond the height of the neighbouring properties, introducing an elevated circular window at this level.
7. Given the disruption to the uniformity of scale and design in this group of gable features, rather than appearing as a modest change it would read as prominent and discordant. By elongating the vertical prominence of the front gable, the proposal would fail to respect the proportions of the appeal dwelling. Furthermore, located in the middle of a terrace group it would not successfully integrate with the character of the immediate surrounding properties. Overall, it would therefore appear out of place.
8. It is acknowledged that other such gable features exist in the wider street. However, these limited examples do not form part of the defining character of the street and serve to demonstrate the visual harm that can be caused by such alterations. In any event, given the curvature of the road the proposed gable feature would be visually separate from these other examples. As such, it would appear as a standalone feature of this type alongside the group of properties to which it relates and against which it would be experienced. In this context, it would read as incongruous.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would be a visually intrusive feature. It would cause visual harm to the site and the contribution it makes to the surrounding character and appearance. As such, it would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Its effect would be localised in an area where a variety of property styles exists. As such, it would equate to 'less than substantial' harm. Nonetheless the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
10. Paragraph 202 of the Framework specifies that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal. While the appellant has stated that the proposal would enhance the function of the property as a family home in the wake of the pandemic, due to its single dwelling nature this benefit would be limited. In addition, while the appellant points out that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents or to amenity space provision, these represent a lack of harm which are neutral considerations. Overall therefore, no public benefits have been put forward which would outweigh the harm identified.
11. For the reasons given above I find that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, it would fail to accord with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and Key Principle CA G3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance SPD (2018), which together seek to ensure good design and preserve heritage assets.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to the fact that planning permission has been granted for all elements of the proposal except for the front gable changes. This is acknowledged, however it is precisely the front gable element of the proposal that causes harm in this instance. As such, little weight can be attached to this fallback position.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR