

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/16/3159619

149 Mirabel Road, Fulham, London SW6 7EQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simone Aroni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/02061/FUL, dated 5 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed front roof extension together with installation of roof lights: removal of existing pitched front roof and replacement with mansard type roof incorporating three roof lights. Finishes of materials to match those of existing. Extra space provided will allow for extra bedroom and internal bathroom fitted with flat roof light installed in existing flat roof."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the upper floors of a three-storey, end-terrace residential property on Mirabel Road, adjacent to the junction with St Thomas' Way. Whilst not within a conservation area, Mirabel Road is characterised by a well balanced row of properties which are largely similar in appearance. The roofs of the properties are uniform in alignment and largely unfettered by extensions or alterations. This creates a balanced rhythm and consistent character to a street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The proposal seeks to erect a Mansard loft extension on the front roof slope of the property. Whilst the extension would utilise identical materials to the host property and surrounding dwellings, it would project forward of the existing roofline. In addition, it would extend most of the width of the property and would have height in line with the existing ridge of the roof. The majority of the existing roof would therefore be obscured. Consequently, the proposal would disrupt the rhythm and pattern of the terrace and would appear in stark contrast to the architectural character of the property.
-

5. The appeal property is particularly prominent given its location at the end of the terrace and the extension would be visible from several vantage points within the area. As a result, it would appear as a dominant and discordant addition to the street scene.
6. I note there are roof extensions at four other properties on Mirabel Road which are similar in design to that proposed here. However, those extensions are not found on the majority of properties within the terrace and appear in contrast to the prevailing character of the street scene, rather than representative of it. Furthermore, it is indicated that those extensions were permitted some time ago and under a different policy context. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits and as such, the presence of similar extensions within the area would not in itself justify the harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would as a consequence conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 which requires development to be of a high standard of design. It would also conflict with Policy DM G3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan 2013 which states that a high standard of design is required in all extensions to existing buildings.

Other Matters

8. I note the lack of objections from local residents, however, that in itself does not outweigh the harm I have identified. In addition, whilst I recognise the proposal would provide additional floor space for occupiers of the property, such a benefit would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR