



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/24/3354860

30 Harwood Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 4PH

- 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 Mr Liam Halfnight against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01476/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an additional floor at roof level; erection of a rear extension at second floor level, over part of the existing back addition; erection of a part one, part two storey rear extension at ground and first floor level, to the side and rear of the existing back addition; and replacement of all windows to the front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Subsequent to the decision made by the Council on the application to which this appeal relates, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area, with reference to the Walham Green Conservation Area (the CA)

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a 3 storey, late 19th century mid terrace house. It is located in that part of Harwood Road that is made up of similar houses in a close set part of the terrace. It retains its original butterfly roof form, set behind a continuous parapet that is shared with other similar properties in this part of the terrace. To the front area are steps to the raised ground floor main entrance and an open area to the lower ground floor. To the rear there is an existing two storey outrigger with a single side pitched roof. The appeal proposal would have the benefit of enlarging the living space provided by the appeal dwelling for existing and future occupiers.
5. The appeal dwelling is a locally listed building. As such, the appeal dwelling is a Non Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA), along with the other houses in the terrace

that are identified on the Council's list. Accordingly, I have considered the effect of the proposal in line with Paragraph 216 of the Framework.

6. In my judgement, the distinctive architectural qualities and the survival of original architectural expression and features of the appeal dwelling contributes much to its significance as an NDHA, together with others in the terrace so identified, despite earlier mansard and substantial rear extensions to other properties in the terrace. I find that, along with the other houses in the terrace, the appeal dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area and the significance of the CA. This appears to primarily rest in its development as an area with mixed uses, architectural periods and expressions, which provide a varied and quality townscape that centres on Fulham Broadway.
7. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
8. A previous planning permission¹ for proposals similar to the appeal proposal includes a mansard roof extension. This would be set behind the front parapet and set back from the existing rear elevation, which would retain the appearance of a butterfly roof. However, the appeal proposal, whilst appearing as a mansard type extension to the front would appear to the rear as a full floor extension, which would align with the existing rear elevation of the appeal dwelling, resulting in the appeal dwelling appearing to have a raised flat roof form, that would eliminate the existing butterfly roof form and appearance.
9. This would replicate the appearance of the rear of the existing second floor extension to the adjoining house in the terrace at 28 Harwood Road (No.28) and at 26 Harwood Road (No.26), both of which eliminate the appearance of original butterfly roof forms. Planning permission for the roof extension to No.28 was given in 2006 and that at No.26 in 1985. Heritage policy and practice develops over time, and it is now sometime since these extensions were given planning permission.
10. From my site visit, it is evident that both of the second floor roof extensions on these neighbouring dwellings interrupt the original butterfly roof forms of the terrace and detract from, rather than complement, the architectural form, massing and details of the host dwellings and the terrace as a whole. As such they appear as incongruous and dominant additions that result in significant harm to the character and appearance of their host dwellings and the terrace of which they form part.
11. The proposed second floor roof extension, by replicating the approach to extending the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling, by creating the appearance of a level parapet and eliminating the appearance of the existing butterfly roof, would replicate this harm to the detriment of the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and its significance as a NDHA. Further, eliminating part of the original butterfly roof form of the terrace would add to the existing harm to the character and appearance of the terrace and would result in the appeal proposal being detrimental to the significance of the CA.
12. I have considered the rest of the appeal proposal in relation to the other extensions and alterations proposed and see no reason but to concur with the Council's

¹ Planning Ref: 2023/01584/FUL

reasoning and conclusion with regard to these resulting in no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, its significance as a NDHA, and the character and appearance of the CA. Lack of harm in this regard is a neutral factor in my considerations.

13. Therefore, when considered as a whole, I find, for the reasons given, that the appeal proposal would not accord with the guidance set out in Key Principles CAG 2 and CAG 3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which seek development that is sympathetic to the character of their context and positively contribute to the townscape of conservation areas, including roof forms.
14. As such and for the reasons given above, I find that the appeal proposal would conflict with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018). Collectively, these seek to ensure that development, including extensions, is of high quality design, respects its townscape context and has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

15. Although I find the harm to the Conservation Area is less than substantial, in accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to its conservation as a heritage asset. In addition, I have given substantial weight to the effects on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and its significance as an NDHA. As the public benefits of the development do not outweigh the harm I have identified, the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and with the heritage aims of the Framework.
16. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR