
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by R J Jackson BA MPhil DMS MRTPI MCMI

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

Decision date: 06 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3168218
22 Haldane Road, London SW6 7EU

- 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 Ms Diana Bardell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/04875/FUL, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a second floor, loft conversion with front and rear tiled mansard and new internal first floor staircase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling. At two storeys high the property is a similar height to the properties to the west, and appears as one of a pair with its neighbour. However, the properties to the east appear as three storeys in height, although 18 Haldane Road has four storeys at the rear. Further to the west are further three storey buildings although some of these are of similar height to the two storey properties nearby. On the opposite side of Haldane Road the properties are mostly two storeys in height.
 4. The overall character of Haldane Road is a residential street set behind North End Road. It has a domestic scale with the buildings set a short way back from the carriageway, and there are prominent street trees on the south side. While there is a variation of height in the buildings in the area, on the north side, there is consistency through a number of shorter terraces of buildings with similar designs which make up a larger whole.
 5. The appeal proposal is to add an additional storey. At the front this would be in the form of a mansard roof with two dormer windows, the whole set a short distance back from the front elevation. The rear elevation would be 'flush' with the rear elevation of the main existing dwelling and would not be angled back.
 6. Although the proposal would be seen against the taller properties to the east when viewed from the west, the proposed additional storey would appear out
-

of keeping with the properties immediately to the west when viewed from in front and from the east. The four properties, Nos 22 to 28 (evens) inclusive, have a consistent parapet line which ensures that these properties appear as a cohesive whole. The introduction of an additional storey, even set back from the front elevation, would harmfully disrupt this and be harmfully out of keeping with the appearance of the area.

7. From the rear the proposal would appear very boxy as if with a flat roof. In addition the window would, both in design and location, be unrelated to the architectural form of the existing elevation or other windows. This would also be harmful to the appearance of the building and the terrace.
8. As such the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Local Development Framework Core Strategy in that it would not create a high quality urban environment that respects local context and character. It would also be contrary to Policy DM G3 of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan in that it would not be compatible with the character of existing development, neighbours and setting, and would not successfully integrate into the architectural design of the existing building. It would also be contrary to paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that it would not appropriately respond to local character nor reflect the identity of local surroundings.

Other matters

9. The appellant indicated that she would be willing to accept a condition amending the design of the rear elevation so that it represented an angled mansard roof configuration rather than being flat. However, this was not in front of the Council and interested parties may wish to make comment on this variation. I, therefore, have not considered this in my decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RJ Jackson

INSPECTOR