



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: 11th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/22/3297518
18 & 20 St. Peters Road, London W6 9BD

- 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 Nichole Detering against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref: 2021/03825/FUL, dated 3 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear roof extensions including the formation of hip to gable roof extensions, installation of 2no rooflights in the front roofslopes, and installation of 2no windows following the removal of 1no window to the side elevations of both properties at no. 18 and 20 St Peter's Road; replacement of 3no windows to the front elevation and 1no window to the rear elevation of no. 18 St Peter's Road with new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form. In my view this more clearly and concisely describes the development and I have used it for my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the host building and the character and appearance of the area, including the St Peter's Square Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Nos.18 and 20 are a pair of semi-detached properties to the south of St Peter's Road. The road comprises a mixture of residential properties and a school and lies within the St Peter's Square Conservation Area (CA). As such, I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Act to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
5. The St. Peter's Square Conservation Area Character Profile explains that the character of the area is derived mainly from the variety of 19th Century residential properties. St Peter's Road, which is an extension to the CA, is more diverse with infill development, nonetheless the character profile specifically comments that the 1930 properties - Nos.16 to 32 (even) St Peter's Road,

- respect the rhythms created elsewhere in the CA and are of an appropriate scale.
6. The proposed alterations to the roof profile would add significant bulk and change the appearance of the building. This would disrupt the consistent and unified form the pairs of semi-detached properties provide as a group within the street scene.
 7. Some of the other semi-detached properties have rear dormer windows, however, these are set within the existing hipped roof, and thereby are of a more limited scale. In contrast, the proposed box dormers would extend over a significant proportion of the whole roof, which in my view would have a dominating effect, and would be visible from public vantage points along Standish Road and Great West Road.
 8. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of roof alterations within the locality, including a recent planning approval for a side dormer to No.15. Having regard to the property types, context, and the form of development I do not find that these are directly comparable to the appeal scheme, and moreover each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
 9. I acknowledge that the proposed materials would match the host building, and that an alternative scheme utilising a side dormer would be visible from the front. Be that as it may, the appellant also explains in their Design and Access Statement that an approved scheme¹ for a side and rear dormer to No.18 would not provide sufficient headroom to accommodate an internal staircase. This alternative scheme is therefore unlikely to be implemented and therefore I have not given it weight as a genuine fallback.
 10. While the joint approach to both halves of the building would provide symmetry, overall, I find that the scale and form of the development would have a harmful impact on the homogeneity of the group of properties and would fail to protect the rhythm within the street scene which is a defining character of the CA.
 11. Having regard to Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (Local Plan) policy DC8² and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the degree of harm that I have identified is less than substantial and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
 12. The proposed alterations would create additional floorspace which would be a direct benefit to the occupier(s) of the properties and there would be some associated economic benefits during the construction phase. Nonetheless as directed by the Framework (paragraph 199) great weight is to be given to the conservation of heritage assets and no public benefits have been identified which would outweigh this harm.
 13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 and Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Planning Guidance SPD (2018) which seek development to be compatible with the scale and character of the setting, to be subservient to and integrate with the

¹ Council reference 2013/03931/FUL

² Policy DC8 refers to paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework, however the corresponding paragraphs of the revised National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 relating to the consideration of potential impacts are 201 and 202.

existing building, and to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

14. Having regard to the matters set out above, and with due regard to all other matters, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR