



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/22/3313337

89 Rannoch Road, London W6 9SX

- 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 Peter Scott against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/02735/FUL, dated 18 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension, the installation of 3no. rooflights in the front roof slope, and the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of a rear roof extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the installation of 3no. rooflights in the front roof slope and the erection of a single storey rear extension at 89 Rannoch Road, London W6 9SX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/02735/FUL, dated 18 August 2021.

Procedural Matters

2. In the interest of clarity I have used an amended version of the description of development given on the decision notice in the banner heading above.
3. The development described above has been carried out. This appeal therefore relates to an application for retrospective planning permission.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crabtree Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2-storey end-of-terrace house. It occupies a corner site with its long side boundary facing Bowfell Road and is a highly prominent element in the street scene. The property is located in the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA), the main part of which comprises speculative Victorian and Edwardian terraced houses laid out in a rectilinear street pattern with streets set out at right angles to the River Thames bisected by longer streets running parallel to the river. Whilst the detailed design of houses in the CA

varies, there is a high degree of uniformity in terms of their scale, materials and relationship to the street. This uniformity is a key feature of the CA and a matter to which I attribute significant weight.

6. The appeal scheme comprises a single storey rear extension, rooflights in the front roof slope and a full-width rear roof addition. The latter has a vertical rear elevation that is to all intents and purposes flush with the main rear elevation below. It is clad in red tiles and includes a pair of windows. It is materially different to the mansard form of roof addition seen on some nearby houses. The flank wall is formed of brick and the addition has a flat roof marginally below ridge level.
7. Due to the site's exposed location, the roof extension is highly visible from both Bowfell Road and from the junction with Rannoch Road. Its prominent siting, together with the boxy form, results in an incongruous form of development that has an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host building and fails to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The harm in this respect is substantial.
8. The appellant has referred to a number of rear roof additions on nearby end-of-terrace houses. These adopt a mansard form and are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. They also highlight the clear harm to the appearance of the CA that can result from roof additions in exposed locations.
9. For these reasons I conclude that the rear roof addition is contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (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. 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.
10. The ground floor rear extension and the rooflights within the front roof slope are relatively inconspicuous features in the street scene. I am satisfied that these aspects of the appeal scheme preserve the character and appearance of the CA and therefore accord with the aforementioned policies. I consider these elements to be both physically and functionally severable from the roof addition and therefore a split decision can be issued allowing these elements.

Conditions

11. As the development is already in place the imposition of planning conditions to control the timeframe within which development must commence, the materials to be used and adherence to approved drawings are not necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the rear roof extension and succeed in respect of the rooflights and single storey rear extension.

S Poole INSPECTOR