



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/22/3292911

246A Lillie Road, LONDON SW6 7QA

- 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 M Ciuffi against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/03919/FUL, dated 6 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an additional floor at roof level, including the formation of a roof terrace to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. For reasons of precision and clarity, I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice. The site address provided on the application form also differs from that on the Council's decision notice. During the appeal, the Council confirmed that the address on the application form was correct. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises the first and second floors of 246 Lillie Road, a three storey terraced building. It is the penultimate building in the terrace and forms part of a group of four similar properties with a consistent roofline and parapet. Due to the curvature of Lillie Road, the chimney stacks on either side of the appeal property are visible above the parapet in views along the road in both directions. From the pavement opposite, the parapet restricts the visibility of the chimneys.
5. The development would provide an additional floor at roof level, across the full width of the building, with raised chimney stacks. As the height would exceed that of the existing chimney stacks, the development would be highly visible in the longer views along Lillie Road. Due to this, the bulk of the development would dominate the roofline and appear as an incongruous feature that does not respect or enhance the character and appearance of the host building or the wider terrace.

6. Amended plans have been submitted by the appellant as part of the appeal. Whilst these show the front elevation of the additional floor set further back from the parapet and behind the front of the chimney stacks, the overall height of the additional floor and raised chimneys is unchanged.
7. I note the appellant has provided an angle of sight diagram that has informed the location of the front elevation on the amended plans. This also demonstrates that the extended chimney stacks will be clearly visible, above the existing parapet, from the pavement opposite. The resultant view would be of two chimney stacks which would appear as uncharacteristically tall and isolated on the roofline.
8. I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that all development creates a high quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context through development of a compatible scale, character, architecture and subservience to existing buildings.
9. In the decision notice, the Council also refers to Policy DC8 of the Local Plan. This policy relates to heritage and conservation and, as the appeal site is not located within or close to a Conservation Area, is not a Listed Building or a locally listed Building of Merit, I do not consider it to be relevant.

Other Matters

10. I have been referred to the additional floor at roof level at 249 Lillie Road as an example of a similar extension to the appeal proposal. Whilst this extension is prominent in views along Lillie Road, as it is located at the end of a terrace and has been designed as a corner feature, and was considered against now superseded planning policy, it is not directly comparable with the appeal proposals. Regardless, any direct comparison with other examples does not indicate that the form of the development would sit comfortably within the streetscene, nor does the existence of other examples justify further harm.
11. Even if I were to consider that the development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties this would be a neutral factor and would not weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR