



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2022

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3286311
145 Stevenage Road, London SW6 6PB

- 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 K Zefi against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/01838/FUL, dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is First floor rear extension.
-

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 Fulham Reach Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within the Fulham Reach Conservation Area significant for its contribution as a narrow strip of land sweeping along the River Thames from Hammersmith Bridge towards the football ground. Its principal elements in defining its character are the river itself, the river bank and views along and across the River Thames. The designation as a CA stands to protect the sensitive nature of the riverside.
4. The appeal property is located close to the riverside within a residential area and forms part of a short terrace of modern houses designed within a small and planned development. The property is located at the end of the row of houses. It sits prominent within the street scene due to its position on the corner with Stevenage Road and Rowberry Close.
5. The dwelling has previously been extended and an extension is proposed above part of this single storey element to enlarge an existing bedroom at first floor level. Save for the fenestration pattern to the gable elevation, it appears as a solid mass of wall together with a low-level ground floor rear extension.
6. By extending above part of this extension would further elongate the bulk of the dwelling seen along the gable end. The original proportions of the building would become detrimentally distorted by a discordant extension, therefore harmful to the original characteristics of the building, and to the character and

- appearance of the street scene. It would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
7. I have taken into account the adjacent terrace houses as well as the other houses considered by the appellant to be comparisons. They may also be corner properties and visually prominent within the street scene. However, these are a different style of house type of much larger proportions to the appeal property, and set in considerably larger plots. These dwellings appear in character, and any extensions appear subordinate to the host dwelling. They do not compare to the proposal before me.
 8. With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and proposals affecting heritage assets, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given that the impact of the proposal would be limited to the character and appearance of the CA, I find that the harm would be 'less than substantial' in this instance.
 9. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There are no public benefits identified with the proposal.
 10. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal before me would detrimentally alter the architectural composition of the original dwelling. It would not be a sympathetic or subordinate addition to the host dwelling or the street scene, and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would thus be contrary to the design aims of Policies DC1, DC4, and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan 2018, and advice contained within Key Principle CAG3 New Development in Conservation Areas of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

Conclusion

11. In the light of my assessment of the main issue, I conclude that the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan and the Framework when considered as a whole. There are no other material considerations that suggest the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR