



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/23/3317007

34 Lakeside Road, London W14 0DN

- 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 & Mrs Michael & Sarah Connolly & Easton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2022/03655/FUL, dated 17 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "the erection of a rear extension at second floor level on top of the existing back addition; installation of 2no rooflights in the front roof slope, 1no rooflight above the main flat roof at roof level and 1no rooflight above the roof of second floor rear back addition; installation of 1no window in the rear roof slope".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey house with an outrigger to the rear. It is situated in a residential street and forms part of a terrace of handsome houses featuring bay windows at the front. The street is located within the Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area (CA), a predominately residential area comprising a mix of scales and types of high-quality Victorian housing.
4. The property has been extended at roof level with a mansard formed in the main rear roof slope to create additional living accommodation. The appeal proposal would comprise a further roof addition above a large proportion of the outrigger. This would create a small additional bedroom. It would have a predominately mansard form with the walls clad in slates.
5. The rear outriggers on the group of houses of which the appeal property forms part retain their original pitched roofs. The proposal would therefore be at

odds with this prevailing pattern of development and consequently a incongruous element in this particular context.

6. I note that there are examples of similar roof additions elsewhere in the area. However, there is no evidence before me that these extensions were granted planning permission recently. In any case each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular local context.
7. Due to its siting, height, form and design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the host building and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It is therefore contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which, in summary, 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. There is also conflict with Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Council's Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which state that extensions should be sympathetic to the architectural character of the built context.
8. Whilst the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA, the harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the occupiers of the appeal property there would be no public benefits arising from it

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR