



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 JUNE 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/24/3354256

Flat B (first and second floors), 179 Hammersmith Grove, London W6 0NL

- 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 J Wood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application reference is 2024/01646/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension with side mansard slope; the addition of 2x dormers to front roof slope and 2x dormers to rear roof slope; a second-floor extension to outrigger with terrace above; internal reconfiguration.
-

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 Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. 179 Hammersmith Grove is a substantial semi-detached property of three storeys over a semi-basement, at the corner of Hammersmith Grove and Benbow Avenue. The appeal relates to Flat B on the first and second floors of the building. The proposed development is the addition of two box dormers to the front roof slope, the re-profiling of the side roof to increase its pitch, the addition of a dormer at the rear with a door to give access to the flat roof of an outrigger which runs to second floor level, and the erection of balustrading to create a roof terrace on top of the outrigger. There would also be internal reconfiguration, and the development would facilitate the creation of additional living accommodation within the flat at third floor level.
4. The appeal site is within the Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area ("the HGCA"), and I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. It also adjoins the boundary of the Bradmore Conservation Area ("the BCA") to the west. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the Framework states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 202). It goes on to advise that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213) and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (paragraph 215).
5. The HGCA encompasses most of the length of Hammersmith Grove, a reasonably broad tree-lined road. The Council's 2001 HGCA Character Profile describes the street as having been laid out from the 1830s or 1840s, developed originally with a

series of semi-detached villas and later with terraces. The scale, height and design of the buildings, the width of the road, and the mature street trees combine to contribute to the spacious and imposing suburban character of the HGCA.

6. The front of No 179 has a double-height bay window at semi-basement and basement levels, stone steps leading to the elevated entrance way, and high sash windows set in arch-topped openings. At roof level, a small, pitched dormer is just visible behind the parapet. The frontage of the No 179 is to all intents and purposes a mirror image of its attached “twin” No 177; the pair therefore form a well-balanced composition which, though not identified as a “building of merit” in the HGCA Character Profile, together make a very positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The rear elevation and roof of No 179, including the outrigger, are visible from the BCA in long views along Benbow Road, and through gaps between buildings from Agate Road.
7. The proposed front dormers would be much larger, and more prominent in public views, than the existing single dormer they would replace; they would disrupt, indeed they would remove, the current balance and symmetry of the frontage of the semi-detached pair of Nos 177 and 179. This harm would be exacerbated by the alterations to the side roof slope, which would give the building as a whole a lopsided look. The loss of balance and symmetry would, given the prominent siting of the appeal property, cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the HGCA.
8. Because the outrigger at the rear of No 179 is taller than that at No 177, and because the rear elevation as a whole is not so prominently on display within either the HGCA or the BCA, symmetry is not such a significant factor at the back of the appeal property. However, the installation of a dormer above the outrigger would break the eaves line of the main roof, disrupting its visual integrity. The new dormer’s siting alongside, but at a lower level than, the existing rear dormer would make it an unusual and incongruous feature. The disruption caused to the appearance of the appeal property would be seen from some distance along Benbow Road and would add to the harm which would be caused to the HGCA. The package of works as a whole would also conflict with advice in the Council’s 2018 *Planning Guidance* Supplementary Planning Document that development in conservation areas should be considered in the context of roof forms and rear and side additions.
9. While there are dormers and mansard roof extensions of various shapes and sizes throughout the HGCA, not all make a positive contribution to its character and appearance. The HGCA Character Profile notes that modern mansard roof extensions often detract from the character and appearance of buildings. The appellant specifically drew my attention to roof alterations and extensions at Nos 117 and 165 Hammersmith Grove, the properties at either end of a long terrace a short way south of the appeal site. Those developments appear to have added substantial mansard-type extensions to a long block where many, but not all, properties already had roof extensions. Given the site-specific circumstances of those two other schemes, neither would have caused the same harm in terms of balance and symmetry which would arise in this case; they do not carry significant weight in favour of the appeal proposal.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area. Given the size of the

Conservation Area as a whole, and the relatively small scale of the development, the harm to the conservation area's significance as a designated heritage asset would, in the Framework's terms, be less than substantial. While the appellant has suggested that the scheme would provide "a significant betterment to the property" such "betterment" – whatever precisely that may be – would be likely to be a private benefit accruing primarily to the owner of the property. The limited weight which I therefore consider it should carry in favour of the proposal would not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset which I have found.

11. The proposal conflicts with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the 2018 Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan, and with Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and other things, those policies require development to respect local context, to protect and enhance heritage assets, and seek to ensure that extensions are compatible with their surroundings in terms of scale and massing. The proposal also conflicts with the provisions of the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector