



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2022

by **S Lo LLB M.SRA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/22/3296476 34 Narborough Street, London, SW6 3AR

- 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 Kate Lamas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2021/03629/FUL, dated 10 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear extension at second floor level over part of the existing back addition; installation of a new dormer window to facilitate a Juliette balcony
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an erection of a rear extension at second floor level over part of the existing back addition; installation of a new dormer window to facilitate a Juliette balcony, at 34 Narborough Street, London, SW6 3AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/03629/FUL, dated 10 November 2021, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL 00; PL 02; PL 03B; PL 04A; PL 05A
 - 4) The roof area of the existing first floor extension shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
 - 5) The building/extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows on the side elevation of the second floor have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that/those windows that are less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the slightly amended description of the development proposed in the appeal form, I am required to consider the appeal on the basis of that provided on the original application form, as indicated in the banner heading.
3. The appeal site is located on the periphery of the Hulingham Conservation Area ("HCA"), but is not located within it. Accordingly, considerations in relation to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are not relevant for this appeal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to the significance of the HCA.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a three-storey end of terrace house on a prominent corner plot, located at an intersection between Narborough Street and Settingington Road. This area is characterised by a reasonably tight urban grain of period terraced properties. Distinctive elements include prominent two storey bay projections and attractive stone window and door surrounds. At roof level, these properties have been substantially altered, with mansard and dormer addition clearly visible elements from the local street scene. Roof extensions of various forms are a visible element of those properties on corner plots, including the appeal building, which has been previously enlarged through rear and side extensions.
6. It is noted that the proposed development would match the proportions of existing extensions which have occurred at the majority of properties within the terrace along Narborough Street. Although the extension at 41 Ashcombe Street may be smaller than the proposed development, it is a relevant example of the general pattern of development. There are sufficient similarly sized extensions in the vicinity to influence the overall character of the area. As the extension would retain a stepped appearance from the ground floor upwards, the proposed development would be characteristic of other extensions in the area. Visual congruity from the rear-view perspective would also be maintained since the proposed development would not protrude further than other neighbouring extensions. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would reflect the local characteristics of the area, specifically in relation to materials, bulk and design. Therefore, the proposed second storey rear extension would not appear incongruous, due to the extent that other similar extensions have occurred at nearby properties.
7. In relation to the prominent corner location, I find that a significant number of similar extensions have already been developed at the majority of properties in the terrace and surrounding area, including properties within the HCA. As such, extensions of this nature and bulk are commonplace and already visually apparent from the public realm. Therefore, it is considered that any added visibility due to the prominent location of the appeal site would not be incongruous with the overall setting of the area.
8. Additionally, the proposed development would not dominate the rear of the property due to its size, as it has already undergone extension works. As these

works cannot be taken in isolation without the supporting bulk of existing extension works, I do not consider that they will dominate the rear aspect of the property in comparison with the existing dimensions of the appeal site. For those reasons, I find that the proposed development would not result in an overly large and bulky extension, such that the overall effect would be inappropriate for the appeal site.

9. This character assessment includes those properties lining Settingington Road to the west, which forms the HCA boundary, where front roof additions of various forms exist. The significance of a conservation area is derived from the residential terraces which share a common Victorian frontage design, with detailed facades and embellishments. The significance of a conservation area is dependent upon how it is experienced. Under such circumstances, case law has established that proposals must be judged according to their effect on a conservation area as a whole. Given the above, I find that there will be no harm to the facades and embellishments of the appeal site. Therefore, as the proposed development reflects the characteristics of the area, any effect on the HCA will be neutral and would thus preserve its significance. Given that there will be no adverse effect on the character of the area, I find that the significance and setting of the HCA will be conserved.
10. Having taken the above factors into consideration, it is my conclusion that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the significance of the HCA. As such, the proposal therefore accords with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018). Amongst other aspects, these policies ensure that that the built environment is compatible with the character of existing development and also conserves designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. I have considered representations from neighbouring properties regarding loss of light and note the Council's assessment that any harm would be within acceptable limits. On the basis of the plans and evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree with their assessment. Accordingly, this is not a matter which affects my findings on the main issue.
12. I have considered representations from neighbouring properties regarding overlooking and loss privacy. Some degree of overlooking is commonplace and generally acceptable in such a built-up urban area. I find that any impacts will be adequately mitigated by the use of glazed windows and a condition has been accordingly imposed.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

S Lo

INSPECTOR