



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2022

by Lewis Condé BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Monday 9 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/21/3287918

15 First Floor, New Kings Road, London SW6 4SB

- 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 Ms Radford against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/03056/FUL, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Mansard roof extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The site lies within the Moore Park Conservation Area (CA). The Council originally submitted a plan for the neighbouring Parsons Green Conservation Area as part of its appeal evidence. However, the correct Moore Park Conservation Area Plan and associated Character Profile were subsequently submitted during the appeal. I have therefore had regard to this document in my assessment of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, including the CA.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a first floor flat located in a mid-terrace of predominantly three storey brick houses with semi-basements. New Kings Road is a street of considerable length with a mix of commercial and residential properties. However, the section of the street that the appeal property lies within is predominantly residential in character.
5. This part of the CA is largely characterised by terraced residential development that share similar design treatments, proportions, massing, and rooflines. Its significance lies in the evidence of historic inner-city residential estate development.
6. Several nearby properties have been extended through the addition of roof extensions, including Mansard roofs. This has resulted in some properties having a different character and appearance at roof level. Nevertheless, the characteristic parapet wall roof profiles are an important part of the historic built form in the area, and makes a positive contribution towards the CA

overall. The original rooflines are therefore worthy of retention. This is reflected in the Moore Park Character Profile 2004 (updated 2008), that indicates that front roof extensions will generally be considered unacceptable.

7. No. 15 along with its immediate neighbours has retained many original features, including bay windows, decorative period doorways, along with parapet walls and characteristic London Butterfly roof forms behind. Therefore, the original historic form and profile of these properties are largely retained.
8. Within the block that the appeal property sits, a number of buildings have roof alterations of a similar nature to the appeal proposal. I do not have full details of these developments. However, three of the properties (Nos 7, 9 and 11 New Kings Road) are located alongside one another with No7 being a corner building of greater height and an alternative design. As such, the extended roof forms of Nos 9 and 11 sit more comfortably with the adjacent corner building, whilst their specific contexts are somewhat different to the appeal proposal.
9. A further example of a Mansard roof addition also exists within the block. However, this example is much more isolated in nature being located more centrally within the terrace and not adjacent to similarly extended buildings. As such, that development appears as a far less sympathetic addition. The appeal scheme would similarly be located within a continuous run of several buildings that are defined at roof level by their long unaltered line of parapet walls.
10. The alterations to No 15 would therefore be isolated from the wider group of altered roof forms and would lack a harmonious relationship with the neighbouring buildings. The proposed Mansard roof due to its scale, form, and position within the terrace, would project a significant distance above the parapet wall and overall roof line of this part of the terrace. Therefore, it would appear as a discordant addition that would not successfully integrate to the architectural integrity of the existing property or wider terrace. The proposal would also compromise the appeal property's existing butterfly roof form. In addition, it would be highly visible within the streetscene causing harm to the character and appearance, and thereby the significance, of the CA. The existence of other similar roof extensions in the locality does not justify the harm that I have identified with the current appeal scheme.
11. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the host property and the CA.
12. Given the scale and nature of the proposal, I consider it would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Nevertheless, any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and in accordance with paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. The proposed development would provide additional living space benefiting the owner(s)/occupant(s) of the appeal dwelling, with the appellant indicating that this would enable the property to be used as a family home. However, in this instance, I do not find there to be sufficient public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm.
14. The proposal would be contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) and Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3

of the Hammersmith & Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (February 2018). Together these policies and guidance, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that developments are compatible with and respect their context, as well as conserve or enhance heritage assets.

15. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Lewis Condé

INSPECTOR