



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/23/3331155

51 Woodlawn Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, 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 Hastbeck Inc c/o A.C.T. London Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2023/01344/FUL, dated 23 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is installation of a roof extension to the rear of the property. Installation of a mansard roof with dormers to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the Installation of a mansard roof with dormers to the front of the property. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the installation of a roof extension to the rear of the property and planning permission is granted for installation of a roof extension to the rear of the property at 51 Woodlawn Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London, SW6 6PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/01344/FUL, dated 23 May 2023, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Dwg Nos: 1561/001-0; 1561/002-0; 1561/251-3; 1561/252-3; 1561/253-3; 1561/254-1; 1561/255-1; 1561/256-1; 1561/257-1; 1561/258-1; 1561/259-1.
 - 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 whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Woodlawn Road bisects streets of terraced housing set out in a grid pattern. Most of the street frontage comprises the side wall of end of terraced houses

and their garden walls, over which rear gardens are visible. The appeal site is in a longer section of road between Harbord Street and Finley Street comprising two terraces of 7 houses each. The houses are set back from the pavement behind low walls, several with hedges behind them. These, along with mature trees along the pavement edge and the views across rear gardens, give the area a verdant appearance.

4. Houses share common design features which contribute to their character and appearance and that of the CA and its significance. They include 2 storey projecting bays with pitched roofed gables at the front which, along with low parapet walls either side of the roof, provide rhythm and consistency to the roofscape. Recessed front porches with decorative detailing around them and corbelled brickwork at eaves level also contribute to the character and appearance of houses.
5. The proposed mansard roof would sit either side of the projecting roof gable and have 3 dormer windows. It would change the profile and dominate the roof and in so doing interrupt the rhythm, which is an important element of the streetscape, described above. Although there are front roof extensions on the adjoining house, No 53, and its neighbour No 55, these predate the designation of the CA and detract from the character of the area, as noted by the Inspector at the appeal for the neighbouring house¹ on the other side, No 49.
6. The appellant has referred to other appeals at Nos 57² and 75³ Woodlawn Road. Each was considered on its own merits and, whilst I do not have the details of those proposals, I note there are differences. No 57 adjoins No 55 which has a front extension which fills the whole roof plane and has high parapet walls either side of it. These would to some extent screen oblique views of No 57's extension when looking down the road towards Finley Street. No such screening exists at the appeal site. It may also provide some balance with the less dominant roof extension at No 53. Regarding the proposal at No 75, the Inspector in that appeal referred to the rear of the host property already having been significantly altered and that the proposed front addition would result in balance and symmetry to it when seen from the side. This would not be the case for the appeal property which is a mid-terraced house from which the side is not visible from the street. I do not therefore consider the examples provided to be directly comparable with the appeal proposal.
7. I appreciate that the rear of properties on Harbord Street, many of which have been altered to include mansard roofs, to some extent form the backdrop to the appeal site. Nevertheless, the rear streetscape is distinctly different to that of the front streetscape. On Harbord Street and Woodlawn Road there are few front roof extensions and as a result they are conspicuously out of character with the prevailing roof form in this part of the CA. The cumulative impact of the proposed development with that of the existing and proposed roof extensions at Nos 53, 55 and 57 would draw attention to the break in the continuity of the roofscape, thus harming the character and appearance of the wider area.
8. I have a duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/23/3320543

² Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/22/3303260

³ Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/20/3264471

preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. Given the small scale of the development within the context of the CA as a whole, the harm to its character and appearance would be localised, limited and less than substantial. However, I must nonetheless give the harm found considerable importance and weight in the context of a duty to favour preservation or enhancement. The proposed development would thereby conflict with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which requires development to protect or enhance heritage assets and extensions to be of a high quality which integrates with the design of the original building.

9. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires justification and, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. Although no public benefits have been put forward by the appellant, there would be modest benefits arising from short term employment during its construction. However, such benefits would not outweigh the harm to the appearance of the building and Crabtree Conservation Area.

Other Matters

10. The appeal property has a 2 storey rear outrigger joined to that of No 49 with which it shares a pitched roof and gable end. A rear mansard roof extension is proposed along approximately half of the outrigger roof. In contrast to other similar developments, it would not be visible from the street or from the rear of most other properties nearby. Where it could be seen, it would be a relatively discrete addition. I therefore agree with the assessment in the Council's Officer Report that it would not harm the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area. As it is physically and functionally severable from the front extension, I consider a split decision would be appropriate to allow planning permission for this element of the proposal.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the installation of a roof extension to the rear of the property. However, in relation to the installation of a mansard roof with dormers to the front of the property the appeal should be dismissed.
12. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR