



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2024

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/23/3334838

First Floor, 15 Munster Road, London SW6 4ER

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Holden Property Group/Propmark Partnership Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2023/01938/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a new door to the side elevation, installation of a new door and window to replace the existing window to the rear elevation and the erection of obscure glazed screen around the flat roof of back addition at first floor level to the rear and side elevation in connection with its use as a terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and on the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located towards the centre of a terrace of three-storey townhouses. The terrace is bordered to the rear and at either end by neighbouring buildings, many of which are broadly similar in height to the terrace itself.
4. The terrace is continuous, with no gaps between properties. A range of rear roof dormers and mansard roof extensions add additional height and mass to the rear of the terrace. These additions combine with the surrounding layout to create a distinct and dominant sense of enclosure for occupiers of rear gardens.
5. The sense of enclosure is reduced by the pattern of development to the rear of the terrace. Generally, ground floor extensions project the furthest rearwards, first and second floor elements less so, and fourth floor less so again. This creates coherent rear building lines in a 'stepped' effect, in which the taller any part of a building is, the further from the gardens it is located. This protects a small degree of openness for gardens in the terrace and in Laurel Bank Gardens, from which the appeal property is visible.
6. The rear of the appeal property contains a mansard roof and single storey rear extension which appear no taller than necessary to provide habitable accommodation. A two-storey outrigger has been altered to include a flat roof and low rails but has been made no higher than the original parapet wall. These additions to the rear of the appeal property match the pattern of

- development described above, and are consistently modest in scale, making them subservient to the host dwelling. Most of the original main rear elevation of the appeal property remains visible and can be easily identified as such.
7. The appeal proposal includes the erection of glass screens to enclose part of a flat roof, creating a first-floor terrace. The opacity of the glazing would make the development immediately visible, and readily distinguishable from the exposed brick of the existing rear elevation.
 8. The development would project significantly beyond the existing 1st floor rear wall, encroaching into and eroding the distinctively open feel of the space at that height, whilst creating the only development of its height and depth at first floor level in the terrace. The scale, location and appearance of the proposal would create a discordant, disproportionately bulky addition, out of keeping with the modest, ordered pattern of rear additions at the appeal property, and wholly incongruous to the surrounding pattern of development, as described above.
 9. Due to its height, depth, and prominent position the development would dominate the rear elevation of the appeal property when viewed from the rear gardens of neighbouring homes and of the appeal site. It would significantly compete for visual primacy with, rather than being subservient to, the existing main rear elevation, giving the proposal an invasive, overpowering presence in that context, harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal site and the terrace.
 10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other roof terraces in Munster Road and further afield. Except for one at No 7 Munster Road, none of the cited examples occupy space beyond the first-floor rear building line in the terrace of which the appeal property is a part and are not comparable to the appeal proposals in that critical respect. They have carried very little weight in my decision, therefore.
 11. I saw during my site visit that there is a first-floor rear door leading to a flat roof at No 7, where a table and chairs are placed. I have no evidence that the arrangement is lawful. Even if it is, it does not have enclosures comparable in height, depth, and prominence to those proposed at the appeal site and does not affect the character and appearance of the area in the same way. It has carried very little weight in my decision, therefore.
 12. I conclude that the proposals would result in a harmfully disproportionate, dominant and intrusive addition to the appeal site, out of keeping with the character and appearance of the local area and the host dwelling. For these reasons I consider the proposal to conflict with Policy DC1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (the Local Plan) where it requires development to respect and enhance townscape context, and Policy DC4 where it requires a high standard of design in respect of scale, form, height and mass, and consideration of the relationship of new development to existing buildings and to spaces between buildings and gardens.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR