



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2023

by L Francis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/22/3305494

First Floor Flat, 39 Boscombe Road, London W12 9HT

- 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 Jeffrey Holt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2022/01467/FUL, dated 23 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear mansard roof extension with rooflight and two dormer windows and installation of two rooflights in the front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2023, during the consideration of the appeal. The Council and the appellant were given the opportunity to comment upon the revisions insofar as they relate to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The area is residential in character, with a mix of single dwellings and converted flats within Victorian terraced and semi-detached houses, occupying plots with front and rear gardens. The appeal site is a first floor flat within a 3-storey building of lower ground, ground and first floor with a hipped roof. It is located within a group of semi-detached pairs, all with linked 3-storey rear additions, lending a distinct character to this section of Boscombe Road, between its junctions with Findon Road and Westville Road.
5. The semi-detached pair in which the appeal site sits each have hipped roofs, along with the end of terrace building adjacent to the south and the two pairs of houses immediately to the north, resulting in a very uniform run of hipped roofs to this part of the street.
6. The proposal involves a hip to gable roof extension, with 2 dormer windows set in a mansard style roof to the rear and 2 rooflights to the front roofslope. The

side wall would be built up in brick to contain the extension. The extension would provide additional living space for the first floor flat.

7. The appeal site is highly visible in views from Westville Road and its side elevation and hipped roof are particularly apparent. The proposed built-up gable end wall and roof form would appear bulky and out of scale with the host property and at odds with the run of hipped roofs in this part of the street, disrupting the appeal site's balance and symmetry with No. 37 adjacent and the run of hipped roofs extending to the north of the appeal site. The visual impact of the proposal would be accentuated by the visibility of the appeal site in views from Westville Road.
8. I note, however, that hip-to-gable roof extensions similar to that proposed are a common feature of the area and my attention has been drawn to several examples. The information provided shows many were constructed pursuant to lawful development certificates, which are subject to a more limited set of considerations than a planning application and as such, I do not find these examples directly comparable.
9. My attention has been drawn to examples on Findon Road, Ellingham Road, Percy Road and Roxwell Road, all of which I saw on my site visit. I do not find the examples on Percy Road or Ellingham Road directly comparable given the detailed design of the buildings and time elapsed since those permissions were granted, which would also have been within a different policy context. Whilst the example at 15 Roxwell Road is a similar style of building to the appeal site, the roof and side elevation do not have the same prominence or visibility as those at the appeal site.
10. Whilst I note the proliferation of similar extensions along Findon Road, again, the context is different. In the 2014 appeal decision¹ for No. 15, the Inspector acknowledged that whilst the hip to gable extension would unbalance the pair of properties, the number of similar extensions had diluted any sense of uniformity in the roof forms along Findon Road. This is not the case in the run of buildings adjacent to the appeal site. The Inspector also noted that the roof extension would only be evident in a short section of the street due to the screening effect of other buildings, which is not the case at the appeal site given the long views from Westville Road.
11. Similarly, I note that the Council's delegated report for a roof extension at 14 Findon Road² justified the extension in terms of it balancing with the existing roof addition to the adjacent building at No. 12, which benefitted from a lawful development certificate. I also note that the delegated report for the roof extension at 23 Findon Road³ stated it would match that adjacent at No. 21. These circumstances are not applicable to the appeal site.
12. Opposite the appeal site I noted similar roof extensions at 32, 34 and 36 Boscombe Road. These buildings are comparable to the appeal site in terms of the similar style of the semi-detached dwellings with linked rear additions. Whilst there are some limited views of the rear of these buildings from Westville Road, the views from Boscombe Road itself are relatively constrained

¹ Reference APP/H5390/A/14/2216816 dated 17 July 2014.

² Application reference 2020/01033/FUL

³ Application reference 2017/04919/FUL

and the houses are not as visible or prominent as the appeal property in long views.

13. The December 2023 updates to the Framework include guidance that mansard roof extensions on suitable properties should be allowed where their external appearance harmonises with the original building, including extensions to terraces where one or more of the terraced houses already has a mansard. I do not find that the appeal property is suitable in this sense given the consistent run of hipped roofs to the north of the appeal site and the uniformity of appearance which defines the character of this part of the street.
14. Taken together, the visibility of the appeal site, symmetry with the hipped roof of the attached house at no. 37, along with the uniform character of the run of hipped roofs from 29 to 41 (odd) Boscombe Road, lead me to conclude that the hip to gable roof extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The proposal would run contrary to the Framework and Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018, which require development proposals to, amongst other things, respect and enhance townscape context and be compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting.

Planning balance

15. The alterations would provide some improvements to the internal layout and accommodation available for current and future occupiers of the property, including enlarged living spaces. However, the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area outweighs the identified benefits.

Conclusion

16. I have found that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it is contrary to the development plan read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

L Francis

INSPECTOR