



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2021

**by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 26 February 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/20/3259452**  
**30 Crabtree Lane, London, SW6 6LN**

- 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 Fergus Maclachlan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
  - The application Ref 2020/01487/FUL, dated 14 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA); and
  - the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of occupants of 28 Crabtree Lane, with particular regard to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal site is in a residential street consisting of terraced housing located in the Crabtree Conservation Area. Common characteristics within the appeal site terrace, which contribute to the character and appearance of the area, include: 2 storey bays with gable pitched roofs; open porches with hanging balustrades and single pitched roofs; decorative tiled front paths; and patterned roof tiles extending in a band from the porch roofs across the gap between the ground and first floor windows. The rear elevations have been extensively altered and have no distinct characteristics that contribute to the character or appearance of the CA.
4. The Council is concerned that the extension because of its scale and depth would appear over dominant and incongruous.
5. The proposed development would be a similar height to the existing extension that it would replace, but it would extend deeper into the garden and across the full width of the house. It would exceed the limits set out in key principle HS4 criterion i) of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) in terms of its depth. However, I note that HS4 also states that the council will have regard to existing established rear building lines of adjoining properties in determining applications for rear extensions. The proposal would not extend beyond the rear building line of the neighbouring property No 32 and, as noted by the appellant, several other houses within the appeal site terrace, and the adjacent terrace, have similar sized extensions which exceed the SPD guidelines.

6. The proposed development would only be seen from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and the rear of houses that back on to it. Within this context it would not appear out of place with other properties, nor would it affect any of the features that I have identified as being important to the character and appearance of the CA.
7. Overall, I conclude on this main issue that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the building and wider CA. It would not therefore conflict with policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (LP) and key principles CAG3 and HS4 of the SPD which seek good design that is compatible with the scale and character of existing development and conserves the significance of the borough's historic environment.

#### *Living Conditions*

8. The proposed development would extend along the boundary with No 28 which has a floor to ceiling window serving what appears to be a living room close to it. The boundary currently comprises a close board fence, approximately half the height of the window, topped with a wooden lattice fence. No 28 has a rear extension which projects out by the side of the living room window. The proposed development, by extending close to the other side of the window and to a greater height than the existing fence, would lead to an increased sense of enclosure and have an overbearing impact when looking out from the window. The side windows of the rear extension at No 28 would look directly out onto the side wall of the proposed extension. It would fill a substantial proportion of the field of vision from this view and would also have an unacceptable impact on the occupants' outlook.
9. I appreciate that the extension has been designed to enable the wall to be lowered with a hip between it and the flat roof to lessen its impact. Also, I acknowledge that the occupants of No 28 did not object to the proposal. However, this does not alter my view that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupants of No 28 in terms of their outlook.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DC4 and HO11 of the LP and Key Principle HS7 (ii) of the SPD which require that development should not lead to a detrimental impact on outlook from the windows of neighbouring properties.

#### **Conclusion**

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

*P D Sedgwick*

INSPECTOR