

Ward: Ravenscourt Park

Site Address:

65 Hartswood Road London W12 9NE



© Crown Copyright. All Rights Reserved. London Borough Hammersmith and Fulham LA100019223 (2013).

For identification purposes only - do not scale.

Reg. No:

2021/02294/FUL

Case Officer:

Paul Curtis

Date Valid:

19.07.2021

Conservation Area:

Constraint Name: Ravenscourt And Starch Green
Conservation Area - Number 8

Committee Date:

07.12.2021

Applicant:

Mr And Mrs James Mann
65, Hartswood Road London W12 9NE

Description:

Erection of a rear roof extension including the formation of a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer; installation of 2no. rooflights in the front roofslope and 1no. window in the new gable end elevation.
Drg Nos: 1326-1; 1326-2.

Application Type:

Full Detailed Planning Application

Officer Recommendation:

- 1) That the Committee resolve that the Chief Planning Officer be authorised to refuse planning permission pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 subject to the reason listed below;
- 2) That the Committee resolve that the Chief Planning Officer, after consultation with the Assistant Director, Legal Services and the Chair of the Planning and Development Control Committee be authorised to make any minor changes to the proposed reason for refusal, any such changes shall be within their discretion.

Reasons For Refusal:

- 1) The proposed hip-to-gable roof extension is considered to be unacceptable on the grounds of visual amenity. More particularly, the total loss of the original hipped roof form and introduction of a bulky gable roof extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building. It would be an overly dominant feature in the street scene, and would undermine the symmetry within the subject terrace and the adjacent terrace within the grouping. The result would be detrimental to visual amenity and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area. In this respect, the proposal is considered to be contrary to s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Paragraphs 195, 199 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Local Plan (2018).

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000
LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS**

All Background Papers held by Andrew Marshall (Ext: 4841):

Application form received: 12th July 2021
Drawing Nos: see above

Policy documents: National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021
The London Plan 2021
LBHF - Local Plan 2018
LBHF – Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document
2018

Consultation Comments:

Comments from:

Dated:

Neighbour Comments:

Letters from:

Dated:

55A Hartswood Road London W12 9NE	08.08.21
63 Hartswood Road London W12 9NE	08.08.21
66 Hartswood Road London W12 9NF	07.08.21
67 Hartswood Road London W12 9NE	02.08.21
57 Hartswood Road London W12 9NE	21.08.21
9 Emlyn Road London W12 9TF	09.08.21
47 Hartswood Road Stamford Brook London W12 9NE	04.08.21
13 Stronsa Road London W12 9LB	13.08.21

OFFICER'S REPORT

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The application premises comprise a two-storey house that sits at the south end of a short terrace of four properties, located on the western side of Hartswood Road, close to the junction with Wendell Road. The properties date from the interwar period. The application site is situated within the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area.
- 1.2 A previous planning application (Ref. 2018/02471/FUL) for a rear roof extension, including the formation of a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer, and installation of 2 rooflights in the front roof slope and 1 window in the new gable end elevation at the subject site was refused by the Council on grounds of visual amenity and this was subsequently dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspector (Appeal Ref. APP/H5390/W/18/3217592). The Council's reason for refusal was as follows:

"The proposed hip to gable roof extension is considered to be unacceptable and inappropriate on the grounds of visual amenity. More particularly, the proposed development, owing to the loss of the original hipped roof form and introduction of bulky gable roof extension, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building. The proposal would therefore undermine the architectural character of the application property and the properties within the grouping, resulting in an overly dominant feature in the street scene which would be detrimental to visual amenity and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the property and the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area. In these regards the proposal is considered to be contrary to

Sections 12 (Achieving well designed places) and 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), policies 7.4 (Local character), 7.6 (Architecture) and 7.8 (Heritage assets and archaeology) of the London Plan (2016), policies DC1 (Built environment), DC4 (Alterations and extensions) and DC8 (Heritage and conservation) of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and Key Principles AH2 and CAG3 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018)."

- 1.3 Planning permission (2021/01600/FUL) was recently approved for the erection of an extension at first floor level, together with a single storey side and rear extension.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application is for the erection of a rear roof extension including the formation of a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer; installation of 2no. rooflights in the front roof slope and 1no. window in the new gable end elevation.
- 2.2 A separate planning application (Ref. 2021/02330/FUL) is also being considered for the adjacent property at 63 Hartswood Road, which is also for a hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer, two rooflights and a new side window. No. 63 is immediately to the south of the subject site, and is also at the end of a similar terrace of four properties.
- 2.3 In support of their application (including the proposal at no.63), the applicant states that:
- the conclusion by the Inspector (2018 appeal) was only reached after it was determined the harm in fact would be 'less than substantial harm' and the unacceptability was only concluded as the proposals did not highlight the benefits to outweigh the harm.
 - the currently submitted proposals are seen as an improvement over the previously refused scheme and appear to be of better architectural quality. Therefore, the harm must be considered 'less than substantial', in line with the assessment made by the Inspector on the previous application at no. 65.
 - in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF, where development proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. In this instance, the 'heritage asset' is the whole of the conservation area and not a single row of terraces.
 - Officers have also raised concern regarding not being able to guarantee the proposals at no. 63 would be implemented, and there is a degree of symmetry between the two and the terraces. Given the numerous examples provided...with regard to hip to gable extensions....demonstrate a number of properties where this symmetry has been lost previously. The harm of any such loss of this supposed symmetry is not noted by officers and in light of the Inspector's previous assessment, this must be considered 'less than substantial'.

Therefore, I would recommend that both applicants enter into a legal agreement to confirm each will implement within 12 months of the final condition discharge. Whilst officers note that each application must be assessed on its own merits, which is correct, however one can't ignore the surrounding context...Furthermore, officers have advised that these examples do not provide justification to 'override the harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area'....the Council have failed to highlight the level of harm caused by the proposals andthis must be considered to be 'less than substantial' in light of the Inspector's assessment previously. In accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF, I suggest the following public/planning benefits which outweigh the harm:

- Both applicants agree to a legal undertaking to implement each application, within 12 months of condition discharge, to ensure symmetry is retained in the streetscape.
- Provision of two, larger family (4 bedrooms) properties within the borough, which allows for growing families and multi-generational families whilst also allowing occupants to remain within the local area, thus providing optimum use for the sites.
- Both applications will secure the ability for the applicants to improve and enhance the existing properties, including external building improvements.
- Proposals will incorporate high quality materials to complement existing dwellings and conservation area.

3.0 CONSULTATION

3.1 The application was advertised by way of a site notice and press advert as well as notification letters sent to five neighbouring properties. Eight responses in support of the application were received from the following properties: 47, 55A, 57, 63, 66 and 67 Hartwood Road, 9 Emlyn Road, and 13 Stronsa Road. Comments raised are summarised below:

- It is important to give young growing families the space they need;
- No. 63 Hartwood Road is proposing a similar development that will preserve the symmetry of the properties;
- The extensions to both properties will be beneficial to the streetscape and the symmetry of both terraces;
- The respective architects for Nos. 63 and 65 have been liaising to make sure the proposed extensions are the same;
- The planning applications are asking for no more than other properties in the area which have received approval;
- The applicants have already invested a significant amount in improving the front of their property.

Officer comment: Support comments are noted. The previous approvals referred to in the comments will be discussed in more detail in the report below.

3.2 There were no other external or statutory consultees for this application.

4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The relevant planning considerations in this case are the impact of the proposal on visual amenity, including on the character and appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area; and the impact on the amenities of neighbours. These matters will be assessed in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance including the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), the London Plan (2021) and the Local Plan (2018) and Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

4.2 A site visit was undertaken in November 2021. The application was also assessed using site photographs provided by the applicant of the subject property and nearby properties.

5.0 VISUAL AMENITY/ CONSERVATION AREA

5.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the principal statutory duties which must be considered in the determination of any application affecting listed buildings or conservation areas. It is key to the assessment of these applications that the decision-making process is based on the understanding of specific duties in relation to listed buildings and Conservation Areas required by the relevant legislation, particularly the s.72 duties of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in the NPPF. s72 of the above Act states in relation to Conservation Areas that: 'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

5.2 Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states: Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

5.3 Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states: Local Planning Authorities should identify and assess the significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

5.4 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight

should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

- 5.5 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 5.6 Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 5.7 Case law indicates that following the approach set out in the NPPF will normally be enough to satisfy the statutory tests. However, when carrying out the balancing exercise in paragraphs 202 and 203, it is important to recognise that the statutory provisions require the decision maker to give great weight to the desirability of preserving designated heritage assets and/or their setting.
- 5.8 Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the asset's significance and appreciation within their surroundings.
- 5.9 Local Plan Policy DC1 requires all development within the borough to create a high-quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context and heritage assets. Local Plan Policy DC8 states that the council will conserve the significance of the Borough's historic environment by protecting, restoring, or enhancing its heritage assets, including the borough's conservation areas.
- 5.10 Local Plan Policy DC4 states that the Council will require a high standard of design in all alterations and extensions to existing buildings. These should be:
 - Compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting;
 - Successfully integrated into the architectural design of the existing building; and
 - Subservient and should never dominate the parent building in bulk, scale, materials or design.

In considering applications for alterations and extensions the council will take into account the following:

- a. scale, form, height and mass;
- b. proportion;
- c. vertical and horizontal emphasis;
- d. relationship of solid to void;
- e. materials;
- f. impact on skyline silhouette (for roof top additions);

- g. relationship to existing building, spaces between buildings and gardens;
- h. good neighbourliness in particular the amenities of the neighbouring properties, and other properties most directly affected by the proposal; and
- i. the principles of accessible and inclusive design

Assessment

- 5.11 The property is an end-of-terrace interwar house located within the Ravenscourt Park and Starch Green Conservation Area. It forms one of four houses in the subject terrace (Nos. 65-71.) Another terrace of four houses (Nos. 57-63) in the same style are located immediately to the south. A further terrace of similar properties is located to the north west on the southern side of Wendell Road. The pair of Hartswood Road terraces and the terrace on Wendell Road form a distinctive part of the street scene, with the dwellings characterised by painted roughcast render elevations and hipped roofs at the ends.
- 5.11 The application site is situated in the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area. In dealing with an earlier appeal for the application site (Appeal Ref. APP/H5390/W/18/3217592) the inspector helpfully characterised the character and special interest of the local area:
- "The immediate vicinity is characterised predominately by terraced and semi-detached houses with hipped roofs, although properties with gable roofs are apparent in the wider area. The roofscape at the appeal site and immediate vicinity has a regular pattern and rhythm of hipped roofs which I find to be a principal characteristic of the area."
- 5.13 Officers consider that the immediate vicinity of the site, in this regard, includes the group of terraces 57-71 Hartswood Road and 105 - 121 Wendell Road which retain their hipped appearance. Alongside the recent appeal decision at the application site the council has also refused planning consent for a hip-to-gable extension at No. 111 Wendell Road (application reference: 2008/00888/FUL).
- 5.14 The design of the current proposal would create a hip-to-gable development which, due to its scale and bulk, would appear as an incongruous feature that would dominate the host property. The development would alter and interrupt the regular pattern and rhythm of the roofscape along this part of Hartswood Road and Wendell Road which would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area.
- 5.15 The flank (south) wall of the host dwelling is set away from the site boundary and is highly visible in wider views from the street. It is considered that the proposed hip-to-gable roof extension would be a disproportionately bulky addition, which would erode the characteristic gap at roof level between these properties, and would be out of keeping with the proportions of the original dwelling house and would fail to achieve subservience to the host dwelling. The proposal would also unbalance the symmetrical composition of the four houses in the terrace and the eight houses in the wider group on Hartswood Road. Within the three terraces in the grouping, the hipped roof character has been largely retained. The application property's hipped roof is mirrored at the northern end of the terrace, No. 71 Hartswood Road, which retains its original roof form and thus the general symmetry of the terrace is currently preserved.

- 5.16 The appeal decision for the previously refused application for a very similar development on the site stated that the hip-to-gable roof extension would, "due to its scale and bulk, appear as an incongruous feature that would dominate the host property" and that "the development would alter and interrupt the regular pattern and rhythm of the roofscape along this part of Hartswood Road, which would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA" (Paras 6 and 7). Officers consider that the Inspector's conclusions on this matter carry significant weight in the determination of this current application.
- 5.17 As it currently stands, the hipped roof form of the subject dwelling is still mirrored on the adjacent property at No. 63 Hartswood Road, and the pleasing symmetry that this mirroring currently creates, would be completely lost. Given the Inspector's conclusions on the matter, the applicant's case for the new proposal appears to be largely based on the fact that the owners of No. 63 currently have a planning application pending to carry out a similar development. If both properties completed hip-to-gable roof extensions, then a new type of symmetry would be created, but this could not be guaranteed. The characteristic 'gap' between the terraces would be lost almost completely. Further, the symmetry of each terrace would nevertheless still be lost. For these reasons Officers do not consider both properties carrying out the extension to be a satisfactory outcome.
- 5.18 The proposal will result in harm to the heritage asset and this harm is deemed to be less than substantial. Accordingly, the Framework requires at paragraph 196 that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. Although, the harm is less than substantial it should not be treated as a less than substantial objection to the proposal. There are considered to be no heritage or public benefits arising from the proposed development.
- 5.19 Officers have assessed the impact of the proposal on adjacent heritage assets and consider that it is not compliant with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The proposal also does not comply with national guidance in the NPPF, namely Paragraph 202, Policy HC1 of the London Plan and Policies DC1, DC4, and DC8 of the Local Plan (2018) and Key Principle CAG3 of the Planning Guidance SPD (2018).
- 5.20 No objection would be raised to the rear roof extension, which would not be visible in any public views and would also generally follow the form of other existing rear dormer extensions on the mid-terrace properties in the group. However, it is to be acknowledged that the dormer as currently proposed is reliant on the hip-to-gable roof extension being carried out, and could not be constructed without it. Similarly, no objections would be raised to the proposed front rooflights which are a common feature of the terrace, but their size and position is also reliant on the proposed hip-to-gable roof extension.

6.0 RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

- 6.1 Due to their position at roof level, the proposed extensions and rooflights are unlikely to have a significantly detrimental impact upon the amenities of

neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight, outlook, privacy, or sense of enclosure, and therefore no objections would be raised in terms of Local Plan (2018) Policies DC1, DC4 or HO11 or Key Principle HS6 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (2018). No new views would be created given the positioning of existing windows. The proposed window to the southern side elevation would serve a landing and the neighbouring property (63 Hartswood Road) has no openings to the northern side elevation, thus ensuring there would be no harmful overlooking or loss of privacy impact to this neighbour. It is considered that there would not be any significant detrimental impact to residential amenity in terms of noise, disturbance, and privacy. As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies DC1, DC4 and HO11 of the Local Plan (2018) and Key Principles HS6 and HS7 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (2018).

7.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 Therefore officers do not support the proposals in line with the recommendations at the start of the report.