
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2022

by David English BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/22/3303260

57 Woodlawn Road, London SW6 6PS

- 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 W. Zhang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2022/00454/FUL, dated 16 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front roof extension involving the installation of three new dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front roof extension involving the installation of three new dormer windows at 57 Woodlawn Road, London SW6 6PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/00454/FUL, dated 16 February 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PA.00 Rev.01; EX.03 Rev.01; EX.04 Rev.01; EX.05 Rev.01; EX.07 Rev.01; PA.03 Rev.01; PA.04 Rev.01; PA.05 Rev.01; and PA.07 Rev.01
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the Crabtree Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Woodlawn Road is a long residential road in an area dominated by traditional terraced housing. Although the Craven Cottage football stadium is close to the appeal property and is visible from the nearby junction of Woodlawn Road and Gresswell Street, the area in the immediate vicinity appeared quiet, and I noted little movement of traffic or pedestrians during my site visit. The streets in the local area are laid out in a regular grid pattern which creates several junctions where adjoining roads cross Woodlawn Road.

4. Other than the short terrace within which the appeal property sits, and the similar immediately adjacent terrace, few properties in the nearby area front onto Woodlawn Road. This results in relatively long gaps in the frontage above the tall boundary walls to the long rear gardens between built blocks of dwellings along the bisecting roads. Notwithstanding the height and prominence of several street trees along Woodlawn Road, public views from the highway towards the rear elevations and roofs of properties on those bisecting roads are available through these gaps. Those views, along with the prominent rear garden boundary walls and gables of the end terraces of the bisecting roads, and the street trees, are dominant elements experienced in the streets. The overall impression while standing in or passing through this part of Woodlawn Road is of this being a pleasant, tight-knit, but verdant, mature, built-up urban area.
5. The appeal property sits centrally within a terrace of seven two storey buildings in a location close to the edge of the Crabtree Conservation Area ('the Conservation Area'). The buildings in this and the adjacent terrace are set back a short distance from the footway where boundaries are marked mostly by low brick walls with taller gate piers, some walls having hedges behind. The buildings have common features to their front elevations including two-storey bay windows with gables above, intricate detailing around entrances, and detailed brick work at the eaves. While some of these features have been modified by external painting, including at the appeal property, overall, they combine to give a pleasing regular appearance and rhythm to the street. The significance of the Conservation Area is derived largely from its distinct regular urban street pattern, and from the regularly repeated common architectural features found in the front elevations of the buildings.
6. The appeal proposal would create a mansard extension to the front, largely replacing the existing roof. Such a proposal on its own would, due to its size and positioning at the front of the building, appear prominent in the street. However, the adjoining property, 55 Woodlawn Road, and the next property along in the terrace, 53 Woodlawn Road, both have similar roof alterations to that proposed, and these are prominent built forms in this terrace. Alongside these alterations are the rear mansard extensions at dwellings on nearby Harbord Road which are readily visible in association with the appeal property. Harbord Road is also in the Conservation Area. While views of these buildings and their roof features are intermittently screened from public vantage points close to the respective buildings by the street trees on Woodlawn Road, they contribute significantly towards a generally common roofscape in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property.
7. Because the appeal site is located within the Conservation Area, I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area as a designated heritage asset. In addition, paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 199 of the Framework further advises that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
8. The proposal would alter the appearance of the appeal property. However, when seen in immediate association with the similar neighbouring roof

extensions, and when viewed in combination with other nearby similar visible extensions, the proposal would not appear as being discordant or incompatible with the surrounding area. The proposal would be an appropriate form of alteration in this context and would be compatible with the host property. Accordingly, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the Crabtree Conservation Area. It would be in accordance with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (February 2018) which, in summary, collectively require extensions to be compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting; respect and enhance townscapes; and conserve the significance of the historic environment by protecting heritage assets.

Other Matters

10. I have been provided with a copy of a recent appeal decision, to which both parties refer, for a front roof extension at 59 Finlay Street which is nearby (APP/H5390/W/21/3270553). I have read the appeal decision and I saw the property on my site visit. The context is different to that in the current appeal before me principally due to the absence of front roof alterations in the relevant section of Finlay Street. From the information available to me, I consider that proposal to be materially different to the one before me in this respect, and that site is not within the Crabtree Conservation Area. Whilst I acknowledge comments made by the Council in respect of consistency, due to the differences I am aware of between these two proposals I afford that earlier decision only limited weight. I have, in any event, determined the current appeal on its merits, paying special attention to the statutory duties placed upon me.

Conditions

11. Conditions are necessary regarding commencement within statutory time limits; in the interests of certainty on the plans approved; and to ensure the character and appearance of the area is not harmed by the materials used in the development.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole and therefore the appeal should be allowed.

David English

INSPECTOR