
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2022

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/21/3289350

Flat A (First and Second Floors), 26 Racton Road, London SW6 1LP

- 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 Amin Yazdi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/02805/FUL, dated 26 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension involving an increase in the ridge height by 150mm; installation of 3no. rooflights in the front roofslope; installation of new doors to replace existing, and installation of a new white timber framed sash window to replace existing, to the rear elevation at second floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear roof extension involving an increase in the ridge height by 150mm; installation of 3no. rooflights in the front roofslope; installation of new doors to replace existing, and installation of a new white timber framed sash window to replace existing, to the rear elevation at second floor level at Flat A (First and Second Floors), 26 Racton Road, London SW6 1LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/02805/FUL, dated 26 August 2021 subject to the conditions set out in the schedule below.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above is taken from part E of the appeal form and the Council's Decision Notice. This is in the interest of clarity.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property, surrounding area and the Sedlescombe Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. No 26 Racton Road is a two-three storey property converted to flats. Flat A is set over the first and second floors. The property is located within the Sedlescombe Road CA. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The Sedlescombe Road CA Character Profile (1998) (CP) sets out that the unique character of the CA is influenced by its original form as the Beaufort House Estate, with a generally coherent pattern of two storey

- residential buildings constructed from a traditional and natural palette of materials and with a variety of detailing.
5. The CP describes the terraced properties on the south side of Racton Road as characterised by a homogenous group with paired front doors and large casement window to the first floor.
 6. The lack of disruption to the roofscapes contributes to this homogeneity and intact coherence. I saw on my site visit that the only clearly visible alteration to ridge height in the vicinity on the southern side of the road was at Nos 44 and 50, which the appellant sets out is an increase of a minimum of 400mm. This is not disputed by the Council. Moreover, I note that the appellant points to a 150mm ridge height increase at No 30. Whilst I understand that this was granted planning permission prior to the adoption of the Local Plan and the most recent relevant policies, its lack of visual impact is apparent.
 7. I therefore consider the proposed 150mm increase in height to the ridge would be minor, as would be the increase in height to the party walls, again shown on plan to be 150mm. When viewed from the street level, the change in appearance of the host property would not be sufficient to result in harm to its character or appearance, nor that of the wider terrace.
 8. Other than the ridge height, the Council has raised no concerns regarding the design of the mansard roof extension to the rear, the proposed rooflights or new doors and windows, subject to conditions regarding materials and detailing. Given the mixed context at the rear of the terrace and from everything I have seen on the site visit and in submissions, I have no reason to disagree.
 9. As such, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host property. The contribution that the property makes to the wider terrace and character and appearance of the area would not be diminished as a result, and the character and appearance of the CA would not be harmed.
 10. I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, surrounding area and the Sedlescombe Road CA. There is therefore no conflict with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) which collectively seek to secure development which would protect terraces from incremental change and local character generally and conserve the significance of the borough's historic environment. These policies are consistent with the design and heritage policies of the Framework and therefore the requirements of Framework paragraph 201 with regards to public benefits are not triggered.

Other Matters

11. I note that letters of objection have been received regarding possible noise and disruption during building works, impact upon privacy, light and outlook, possible structural damage and loss of property value.
12. The rear roof extension would be contained within the rear roof slope. As such it would be unlikely to lead to a detrimental effect on outlook from or light reaching the windows, garden area or roof terrace area of either adjoining property. Similarly, the rear facing windows and bi-fold doors would not offer any additional overlooking over the existing windows and roof terrace.

13. Given the scale of development any build disruption would be limited. Any building work would also be subject to legislation and control regarding structural issues. Finally, the impact on the value of neighbouring properties is not a material planning consideration.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested conditions in its Officer report, and I have considered these in light of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
15. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have attached a further condition relating to matching materials in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. For the same reason I have imposed conditions specifying conservation type roof lights and ensuring that the replacement window and door match the existing and that the colour of the aluminium framed bi-folding doors and dormer window match the existing fenestration. I do not consider that the further submission of sections and samples is necessary to this end.
16. I also do not consider a condition requiring the Juliet balcony to be fixed flush necessary to protect neighbouring amenity, as submitted plan 002 B shows no significant balcony.

Conclusion

17. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Location Plan, PP-14, 001 B, 002 B, 003 A, 004 A.
- 3) 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.
- 4) The rooflights hereby permitted shall be of a conservation style and fitted flush with the adjoining roof surface and shall be retained in that form thereafter.
- 5) The replacement window and door shall match the existing in terms of opening style, frame thickness, profile, glazing bars, materials and colour, and shall be retained in that form thereafter.
- 6) The frame of the bi-folding doors and dormer window shall be finished in a colour to match the existing fenestration and shall be retained in that form thereafter.