

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/16/3161590
2 Rosaline Road, London SW6 7QT

- 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 Narendra Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/02688/FUL, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a front and rear roof extension; erection of a rear extension at second floor level over part of the existing back addition; erection of a rear extension at first floor level over part of the existing back addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development given on the appeal form in the banner heading above, which more accurately captures the scope of the appeal scheme than the description given in the planning application form. Moreover, I note that the appellant and Council agreed to the change during the course of the application's determination.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be firstly, the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its host building and surroundings; and secondly, its effects on the living conditions of the occupants of 246, 248 and 250 Munster Road in terms of the outlook available from those dwellings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Situated at the end of a long terrace of two-storey residential properties, the appeal building, like its neighbours, and those across the road, is of two storeys, brick-faced, bay-fronted, and set back from the highway behind modest front gardens bounded by short brick walls. The terrace has a strong sense of rhythm and consistency of detailing, imparted by the regularity of its bay windows, structural openings, party wall upstands and chimney stacks.
-

5. The proposed development seeks comprehensive alterations to the appeal building's roof replacing it with a mansard style roof to the front with two dormer windows. The appeal building's flank wall and party wall upstand would be built up to either side to a higher level than, and proud of, the mansard roof. At the rear, a flat roof structure with a Juliet balcony on its rear elevation would replace the appeal building's existing roof slope. The existing rear outrigger would be extended at first floor to the same depth as that of the existing extension at ground floor level. A dormer would be inserted in the new rear roof element above the extended rear wing.
6. The appeal building's host terrace is a long one, and whilst I noted two other mansard roof alterations along it, the front roof slopes of its constituent dwellings were otherwise intact, except for rooflights inserted here and there. I also note the Council's comment that no planning history exists in relation to the two mansard alterations within the block. As a result, the existing mansards do not establish a predominant pattern for the appeal scheme to replicate; and conversely, serve to demonstrate how such extensive alterations could be discordant and incongruous in the context of the consistent proportions and detailing and the wider rhythm of the terrace.
7. Moreover, the appeal building's position at the end of the terrace would render the proposed alterations starkly visible. As a result, the proposed height and depth of the flank wall and party wall upstand, combined with the scale and massing of the front mansard would create a dominant impression insensitive to the proportions and detailing of its host building, and discordant in terms of the rhythm of the wider terrace. As a consequence, the proposed development would cause considerable harm to the character and appearance of its host building and its surroundings in this regard.
8. The rears of the appeal building and its neighbouring properties directly address Aintree Street and are thus widely visible in public views. I saw that alteration to the rear of the Rosaline Road properties is by no means unusual including at roof level. However, the depths of the first floor outriggers are generally consistent. In this context, the proposed first floor rear extension would read as excessive and discordant, and would disrupt the balance of the attached outriggers of the appeal building and 4 Rosaline Road to an extent that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
9. Whilst I note comments that the appeal building is not in a conservation area and is not listed, these matters do not alter my findings of the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings as a result of the proposed development. The use of matching materials would not soften these harmful effects to any material degree.
10. Thus for the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause considerable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings. As a result the proposed development would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) (the Core Strategy) and DMG3 the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan (adopted July 2013) (the DM Plan). Amongst other things, and taken together, these policies seek to ensure that all development within the borough creates a high quality urban environment which respects and enhances its townscape context; and that alterations and extensions are of

a high standard of design compatible with the scale and character of existing development.

Living Conditions

11. I saw that the rear aspects of 246 to 250 Munster Road face the side of the appeal building. The proposed development would introduce a considerable amount of additional flank walling to the front and rear of the appeal building.
12. I saw that a first floor outrigger window in No 250 would face directly onto the flank wall of the proposed first floor rear extension. Due to the depth and scale of the rear extension's blank flank wall, and its proximity to No 250's outrigger window, it would constitute an enclosing structure that would impair the outlook available from this window to a material degree. This would, as a consequence, be of harm to the living conditions of No 250's occupants in this regard.
13. No 248 has an outrigger window at first floor that looks directly onto the flank wall of the appeal building. This is a small window, the outlook of which is dominated to a considerable degree by the existing form and scale of the appeal building. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would not impair outlook from this window to a degree that would be material. Whilst the increased scale of the flank walling would be visible from other rear windows in No 248, due to the distance of those windows from the appeal building the proposed development would not be a dominant presence in views from them, and would thus not materially reduce the quality of outlook available. As a result, I consider that no material harm would be caused to the living conditions of the occupants of No 248 as a result of the proposed development.
14. In terms of No 246, I noted that the rear wall of its outrigger has no windows that look out onto the appeal building. The windows on the return wall of its outrigger would only afford oblique views of the proposed development; and whilst the windows of its main rear elevation and dormer would face the enlarged front part of the flank wall they are at a sufficient distance from it so that the outlook available from them would not be impaired to any material degree as a consequence of the proposal. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would cause no significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 246 in this regard.
15. Whilst I have found no harm to the living conditions of the occupants of Nos 246 and 248 would occur as a result of the development, I have found that the proposed development would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 250 as a result of its effects on the outlook available from the rear outrigger first floor window. As a consequence, the proposed development would conflict with Policies DMA9 and DMG3 of the DM Plan, and SPD Housing Policy 8 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (adopted July 2013). Taken together, and amongst other matters, the policies and guidance seek to ensure that extensions protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and avoid detrimental impacts to the outlook available from the windows of neighbouring properties.

Other Matter

16. I note that there were no objections to the proposed development at application stage. However, this matter does not alter my conclusions in regard to the harm that the development would cause to the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of the occupiers of 250 Munster Road.

Conclusion

17. The proposed development would avoid causing material harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 246 and 248 Munster Road. However, this is merely indicative of a lack of harm in these respects as opposed to a positive benefit of the scheme, and in the overall planning balance is demonstrably outweighed by the considerable harm caused to the character and appearance of the host building and surroundings, and to the harm caused to the living conditions of the occupants of No 250.
18. The proposed development would thus conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been drawn to my attention are concerned. As no material considerations have been advanced sufficient to outweigh this conflict I conclude, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, that the appeal should be dismissed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR