



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/22/3293993 63 Hartswood Road, London W12 9NE

- 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 L Jenkins against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/02294/FUL, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof conversion, rear dormer, 2 rooflights to front elevation,
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Concurrently with this appeal I am also the appeal inspector for APP/H5390/D/22/3292526 which is for the same form of development to the neighbouring property, 65 Hartswood Road (No.65). That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
3. No.65 was the subject of an earlier appeal for a "*loft conversion consisting of hip to gable alteration with barn end. Veluxs to front roof slope. Dormer to rear roof plane*" dismissed in March 2019 – reference APP/H5390/W/18/3217592

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on; the host property and the character and appearance of the area, including the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. Along the length of Hartswood Road and in the neighbouring streets are a range of terraced and semi-detached properties of a variety of architectural styles. The properties are generally within groups which have a consistency, and the pattern and rhythm of the properties, in particular the roofscapes, contribute to the character of the CA.
6. No.63 is an end of terrace property located within a group of interwar houses of the same form, Hartswood Road Nos.57- 63 and 65-71 (odd) and around the corner in Wendell Road Nos.105-111 (odd). They have a simpler appearance to the nearby Arts and Craft properties but collectively have a notable style

comprising white painted render with bay windows to the front and shallow pitched hipped roofs.

7. The Council's concerns are restricted to the proposed hip to gable change to the roof profile. During my site visit I observed rear dormers to other properties within the terrace group and I have no reason to disagree with the Council's position that a rear dormer and rooflights would be acceptable additions to the property. Notwithstanding this, the scale of the proposed dormer window is contingent on the change to the roof. This change would add significant bulk at roof level and together with the same alterations to No.65 would erode the visual gap between the neighbouring properties, fundamentally altering the character and visual appearance of the terrace group.
8. As part of the appeal the appellant has provided a comprehensive dossier of roof alterations to other properties in the surrounding area. Each proposal is to be considered on its own merits, and while I did see properties where hip to gable alterations have taken place, these are all outside the terrace group in which the appeal site is located. Additionally, the properties within Emlyn Road and Wendell Road have a driveway width separation and thereby the visual terracing and change to the appearance of the property does not have the same dominating impact as it would at the appeal site. I acknowledge that the pitch to No.57, at the other end of the terrace, has been altered, however, a hipped form is retained, and it is located adjacent to a semi-detached property with a hipped roof. As such, I do not find that the impact on the street scene is directly comparable to the proposed change to adjacent end of terrace properties.
9. Whilst the concurrent proposals for No.65 would provide symmetry and consistency, there is no mechanism before me which would ensure that both schemes are implemented. Moreover, this would not overcome the harm I have found to the character of the area, and which reflects the findings of the previous appeal decision for a similar development to No.65. Nor have I been directed to any specific changes in policy or guidance relating to this type of development which have occurred since that appeal was determined.
10. The effect of the development on the CA would be localised and the degree of harm would be less than substantial. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) paragraph 202, the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal and where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
11. The development would increase the floorspace of the property and create an additional bedroom to the benefit of the occupiers. The appellant has highlighted other proposed enhancements to the property which reintroduce original features, although, alterations to the front garden, boundary treatment and front door are not contingent on the changes to the roof and, in my view, would not mitigate the harm. As advised by paragraph 199 of the Framework, great weight is to be given to the desirability of preserving designated heritage assets, and I do not find in this case the harm would be outweighed by public benefits.
12. Overall, I find that the form of the development would be out of keeping with the host property and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Thus, it would be contrary to policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and

policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other things, require development to be compatible with the scale and character of the setting, integrate with the existing building, and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Other Matters

13. The development would be constructed in materials to match the existing property, and the proposal has support from several neighbours. I also acknowledge the joint and collaborative approach presented by Nos.65 and 63. However, these factors do not alter my findings and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

14. For the reason set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR