

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3174498

37 Alderville Road, London, SW6 3RP

- 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 & Mrs Cotte & Trumpfheller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/05485/FUL dated 20 December 2016 was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the front roof profile, including new timber window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace property located on the western side of Alderville Road, in a predominantly residential area. This road contains mainly two storey terrace properties which contain regular features, such as two storey front bays and recessed front entrance doors. Whilst there is variety in the form and architectural detailing of the terraces along this road, the presence of front bays and other features, such as low front boundary walls, provide a rhythm and structure to the streetscene that contribute to the unified character and appearance of the area.
 4. The proposal seeks permission for a roof extension at the front of the property which would span its width. It would have a steeper front roof pitch than the existing and would also extend the flat roof form that currently exists at the rear. Whilst I recognise that the proposal has been designed to reflect the mass and roof pitch of the extension at No. 35, it would introduce additional bulk at roof level that would be unsympathetic to the traditional form of this terraces roof.
 5. I acknowledge that there are differences as the appellant has set out between the appeal terrace and the terrace opposite. Nevertheless, both terraces exhibit a relatively simple, traditional roof form. Whilst there are front dormer
-

extensions at No's 35 and 46 Alderville Road, these examples do little to support the proposal and seek to demonstrate the harm that would be caused by the appeal scheme.

6. The appellant has also referenced other front roof extensions. Whilst the full circumstances of these are not before me, these referenced extensions are however situated in the wider locality on other streets. From my site observations, these referenced terraces and streets contain a much greater proportion of front roof extensions than the appeal terrace which conversely, retains a generally consistent roof form at the front other than the adjoining property at No. 35. The proposal would introduce a further discordant feature on the terrace that would adversely harm the contribution the existing roof form makes to character and appearance of the area.
7. I note the limited increase in the size of the roof that would arise from the proposal and that it seeks to utilise traditional and high quality materials. However, because the proposed alterations would be at roof level, it was evident from my site visit that the development would be clearly visible in the streetscene, particularly from the opposite side of the street.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable adverse harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. This would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy DM G3 of the Development Management Local Plan. Amongst other things, these policies require development to be of the highest standard of design and be compatible with the scale and character of existing development.
9. I note the appellant's reference to paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which states that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes. Nonetheless, it is clear at paragraph 58 that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character, which the appeal proposal would fail to do.

Other Matter

10. I acknowledge the appellant is seeking to make better use of the site and that the scheme gains policy support in this respect. However, given the harm that I have identified in respect of the main issue, I do not consider the proposed development would be the form of sustainable development that the Framework intends there to be a presumption in favour of.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including reference to the site's planning history and the appeal property not being within a Conservation Area or a listed building, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR