



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2022

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3284793

139 Carnwath Road, London SW6 3EJ

- 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 Paul Joyce against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/01777/FUL, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Ground floor extension, loft conversion with front and rear dormers. Internal and external refurbishment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front and rear dormers.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted to erect a single storey rear extension at 139 Carnwath Road, London SW6 3EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/01777/FUL, dated 27 May 2021 so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, 2376 – EX 001 Existing drawing, 2376 – EX 201 Existing elevations and sections, 2376-PP-001 Proposed Drawings, 2376-EX-201 Proposed Elevations and Sections, Flood risk assessment.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials that match the existing dwelling, in colour, texture and finished appearance.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the Sands End Conservation area, and;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 137 and 141 Carnwath Road, with particular reference to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located within Sands End Conservation Area. Its significance derives from its association with the River Thames and the legacy associated with extensive industry and storage development of the 1800's. The River Thames frontage provides the focal point of the CA. Industrial buildings have given way to modern housing and leisure developments although there remains reminders of the industrial past. The river frontage remains significant as part of its defining character.
5. The appeal site forms part of a modern housing development of both houses and flats built in courtyard style layouts with communal parking to the front, and rear gardens. It is set amongst a uniform terrace of houses and sits back to back with a similar housing development with all sides enclosed by garden areas.
 - *Dormer windows*
6. The existing roof contributes to the sense of visual balance along the street-scene whereby roofs of the terrace remain largely unaltered. The proposed dormer windows to both roof elevations would fundamentally alter the shape of the roof and substantially increase the upper bulk of the property. This would create a top-heavy appearance to both the front and rear elevations of the host property, in particular the rear elevation where the roof would be substantially altered.
7. The scale, proportions and design of these dormers would be inappropriate in relation to the size of the existing roof slopes and would appear dominant. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature. Even though the appeal property forms part of a modern development, it forms part of the CA and the proposed roof additions would be seen in views from beyond the appeal site. They would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
8. The proposed dormers would not be comparable in style and size to other roof extensions that have been brought to my attention by the appellant. These may be located within the same development complex, although they relate to different properties and are not within the same terrace of houses as the appeal property. I discount these as comparable examples.
9. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and proposals affecting heritage assets, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given that the impact of the proposal would be limited to the character and appearance of the CA, I find that the harm would be 'less than substantial' in this instance.
10. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefits of the proposal to the appellant would be private benefits. There are no public benefits identified with the proposal.
11. I therefore conclude that the roof alterations as part of the scheme would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Therefore, the

proposal would be contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Local Plan 2018 and Key Principle CAG3 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 in their combined design aims and objectives to protect the historic environment.

- *Rear extension*

12. To the rear of the row of houses, they may be void of extensions and erecting a single storey extension would be a new addition. However, its scale would reflect the proportions of the host dwelling. Its style and materials would also respect the host property.
13. It would be low level in nature and given the position of the dwelling within the terrace, it would not be clearly visible from beyond the appeal site. Even so, I consider it would correspond with the architectural composition of the main dwelling and would be a sympathetic addition to it and to the character and appearance of the CA.
14. I therefore disagree with the Council and find that this element of the scheme would not appear visually discordant. It would thus comply with policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Local Plan 2018 and Key Principles HS4 and CAG3 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 in their combined design aims.

Living conditions

15. The extension would project approximately 4m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. There are houses to both sides of the appeal property. The proposal would extend along the shared party with these dwellings. Its projection along the party boundary at approximately 4m may not comply with Council recommendations. However, this should be considered against the facts on the ground.
16. No 137 Carnwath Road has a rear door close to the party boundary with the appeal site. As this serves the hall, the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on this internal area as it is not a habitable space. To the other side at No 141, a ground floor window is closest to the party boundary although it is set in from it.
17. Given the location of this neighbouring window and its otherwise open outlook, I do not consider the occupants would suffer from the proposed extension appearing overbearing or a detrimental sense of enclosure, harmful to their living conditions. There may be some reduced light levels into this window as a consequence of the proposal. However, it would not be so severe as to render the scheme detrimentally harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of this dwelling.
18. From the garden area of both adjoining houses, the occupiers would be able to view the proposed development, although a substantial portion of the garden of the appeal site would remain. However, given the limited expanse of extension and an otherwise open outlook from these gardens, their living conditions would not be adversely affected.
19. I therefore conclude that the single storey rear extension by virtue of its siting, projection and scale would not lead to harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 137 and 141 Carnwath Road arising from a sense of

overbearing, enclosure, loss of light or outlook, or to the garden area. It would thus accord with the broad aims and objectives of Policies DC4 and HO11 of the Local Plan 2018 and Key Principle HS4 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 to safeguard residential amenity.

Other Matters

20. I have found that the roof alterations would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA. However, I am satisfied that the proposed single storey rear extension is both physically and functionally severable from the proposed roof alterations. In these circumstances, I am able to issue a split decision and will grant planning permission for the single storey rear extension.

Conditions

21. In addition to the standard time limit I have considered the other conditions having regard to the tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the list of plans in the interests of certainty and a materials condition in the interests of the appearance of the building.
22. Should the area above the extension become used as external space for the appellant to use as an extension to their home or for storage purposes, this would require planning permission in its own right.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the front and rear roof alterations but allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension, subject to the conditions set out above.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR