



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/24/3356633

146 Dalling Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London W6 0EU

- 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 K2L Designs Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01965/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension, involving an increase in the ridge height by 225mm; installation of 2 rooflights in the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to Council's decision, 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.
3. As the description of development varies between documents submitted, I have used that from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and accurate description of the proposal that has also been used by the appellant in their statement.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area, with reference to the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a two storey plainly designed, cottage style, mid-terraced house, within a run of terraced houses of unified design at 144 to 160 Dalling Road (the terrace). These present as a coherent group within the streetscape. It is located within that part of the CA that is made up of streets of small 19th Century terraced houses that retain much of their original architectural details and features, and that form a cohesive townscape. As such, the appeal dwelling contributes to the significance of the CA.

6. 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.
7. The appeal dwelling, along with the others in the terrace, are locally listed Buildings of Merit and are therefore Non-Designated Heritage Assets. In my judgement, the little change from the original appearance of the appeal dwelling and its coherence with other original houses in the terrace in street views contributes much to its significance as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). I have considered the effect of the proposal in line with paragraph 216 of the Framework accordingly.
8. In order to achieve a 2m floor to ceiling height, the proposed rear roof extension would require the roof ridge of the appeal dwelling to be raised by approximately 225mm. Currently the roof aligns with that of its neighbours in the terrace and their unified appearance is apparent in wider street views, as well as directly from the front. I note that the 2 rooflights to the front roof slop replicate those allowed under a previous permission, however, the proposed increase in roof height would result in the continuous roof line of the terrace being interrupted, which would also be apparent in these views.
9. This apparent interruption of the roof line would result in the appeal dwelling appearing incongruous in relation to its neighbours in the terrace. This would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it form part. This would be detrimental to the significance of the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part as NDHA's.
10. As such, the proposal would fail to reflect the existing coherence of the terrace and the contribution this makes to the quality of the streetscape. This would detract from the contribution that the appeal dwelling, and the terrace of which it forms part, make to the significance of the CA.
11. For these reasons, the proposal does not accord with Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 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.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other terraced houses in Cardross Street in a neighbouring conservation area that have had their roof ridges raised. It is apparent that this street has a history of such alterations to the terraces, and from my site visit, it is apparent that these have the effect of breaking an originally unified roof ridge, demonstrating the detriment that this has on an otherwise unified character and appearance. The change in height of roof ridges would have been considered on their own individual merits over time. In this instance there is no history of such changes in ridge height, and I have done likewise in considering the proposal on its own individual merits, which is a key tenet of the planning system. For these reasons, I have afforded these examples only limited weight in my considerations.
13. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area, as well as to the significance of the CA. This would conflict with Policies DC1, DC4, DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan

(2018), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework. Collectively, these seek to ensure that development, 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.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. The harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling as an NDHA, the terrace of which it form part, and the streetscape of the local area is substantial, although the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of such heritage assets.
15. The proposal, whilst increasing the size of the appeal dwelling and providing an additional bedroom would be of primarily private benefit. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA, and, in addition, significant weight to the effects on the character and appearance of the appeal property as an NDHA. I consider that these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
16. For the reasons given, and with regard to all other issues raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR