



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/23/3334449

4 Greswell Street, London SW6 6PP

- 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 Alessandro Garelo Cantoni against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2023/02556/FUL, dated 2 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a front mansard and rear roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crabtree Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No.4 is a mid-terrace property with a two-storey bay window and a gable above. It is reflective of the other properties along Greswell Street and forms part of the Crabtree Conservation Area (CCA). The significance of the CCA is derived primarily from its regular urban street pattern, and from the repeated architectural features found in the front elevations of the buildings.
4. Alterations to create a mansard roof with dormers are proposed to both the front and rear of the property. The Council has raised no objection to the rear element, and similar changes have been made to neighbouring properties and I have no reason to disagree. As such, my considerations are primarily restricted to the proposed alteration to the front roof slope.
5. Due to its position the mansard roof would be a notable addition which would significantly change the composition of the front elevation. The appeal property is part of a terrace comprising Nos 2 to 18 (evens), although due to the limited separation, the whole of the northern side of Greswell Street appears as a continuous terrace. Whilst four of the properties do have mansard roof additions, for which there is no planning history, the original form prevails and there are no alterations to the other side of the road. As such, Greswell Street has a strong rhythm and consistent architectural form along its full length.
6. The general design: extending between the party walls, with a 70-degree slope and matching materials, would respond to the existing property and reflect the

proposed alterations to the rear. Such additions to the front are a feature of the wider area and the appellant has referred me to several other schemes where similar alterations have been permitted, including appeal decisions. These however relate to different streets and, from the details before me, other similar proposals to properties along Greswell Street have been refused (including on appeal as referenced by the Council).

7. I acknowledge that the comprehensive uniformity and unaltered roof spaces throughout the Conservation Area have altered over time. Nonetheless, compared to other streets, such as Inglethorpe Street and Queenmill Road where the appellant notes numerous roof alterations, in Greswell Street the original profile and design have been retained. In the context of the appeal property's immediate neighbours, and the very limited and historic alterations along Greswell Street I am not convinced that these other schemes provide justification to enable further incremental erosion of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be a prominent feature altering the architectural form and unity of the frontage and therefore diminishing the significance of the CCA.
8. The harm that the proposed development would cause to the CCA would be less than substantial. I appreciate that the alterations would provide enhanced living space and as noted by the various planning applications there is a desire from other neighbours to make similar alterations. Nonetheless, the development would be for the direct benefit of the occupiers and increased accommodation can be, and has been, achieved through other alterations including roof additions to the rear. As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework great weight is to be given to the conservation of heritage assets and there are no identified public benefits that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and would fail to preserve the CCA. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, which amongst other matters seek to ensure that development respects the existing context, character and appearance of an area and requires development to protect, restore and enhance heritage assets.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR