



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/24/3356446

22 Chesilton Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 5AB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Claire Reynolds against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/02022/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level. Formation of terrace at rear upper ground floor level with painted metal railings. Modification of existing fenestration at rear upper ground floor level with installation of three French doors. Two storey rear extension at first and second floor levels on top of existing lower ground floor and upper ground floor extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. After the Council's decision on this appeal, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024). I find that there are no major changes affecting the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area,

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a late 19th Century mid-terrace house set over 4 stories, including its lower ground floor. To the rear is an existing two storey extension with mono-pitched roof that is the full width of the original house. The appeal dwelling forms part of a terrace that, along with the terrace opposite, results in coherent and high quality streetscape. To the rear of the dwellings in the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part, it is apparent that there are a number extensions that vary in scale and design.
5. The Council's decision notice and officer report state that the appeal dwelling is located within the Central Fulham Conservation Area (the CA). However, it is apparent from the Map of the CA provided to me by the Council, that the boundary of the CA runs along the boundary between the rear of the gardens of the terrace of

which the appeal property forms part and the rear gardens of the properties in the terrace that fronts onto Rostrevor Road. Therefore, the appeal dwelling is not located within the CA, and, consequently, I have considered the effect of the appeal proposal on the setting of the CA only.

6. The appeal proposal includes extending the first and second floors of the appeal dwelling on top of and to the same depth and width as, the existing two storey rear extension. Whilst there are a variety of extensions to the rear of other houses in the terrace, there are no full width extensions that are also the full height of their host. There are only full width extensions that reach as far as the first floor, and full height extensions that are approximately only half the width of their host dwellings and appear as outriggers. Planning permission¹ was previously granted for a proposal that included first and second floor extensions to the appeal property, which followed this pattern of being approximately half the width of the property and that would appear as an outrigger.
7. Due to the width, height, bulk and massing of the proposed two storey extension at first and second floor levels it would not complement the existing form of the appeal dwelling or the terrace of which it forms part. Rather, it would have the effect of making the rear wall of the appeal dwelling step out from the continuous rear building line of the main rear walls of other houses in the terrace. As a result, the proposed two storey extension at first and second floor levels would not appear as subservient additions to the appeal dwelling. Rather it would appear as an unduly prominent, dominating and incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part, particularly in views of the rear of the appeal dwelling from surrounding properties.
8. For these reasons, the proposed two storey extension at first and second floor levels would not accord with the guidance set out in Key Principle HS4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018). This advises that development has regard to the existing established building line.
9. I have considered the rest of the appeal proposal for a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level, the formation of terrace at rear upper ground floor level with painted metal railings and the modification of existing fenestration at rear upper ground floor level with installation of three French doors, and see no reason but to concur with the Council's reasoning and conclusion with regard to these other extensions and alterations, when considered individually, would result in no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling.
10. I have considered the appeal proposal in relation to its effect on the setting of the CA. As the proposed height matches that of the existing dwelling and terrace, the additional bulk would not be significantly apparent in views of the CA, resulting in no significant harm to its setting. The absence of harm is considered a neutral factor in this instance.
11. However, when the appeal proposal is considered as a whole, I find, for the reasons given above, that it would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part. As such, it would not accord with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham

¹ Planning Ref: 2023/03281/FUL

Local Plan (2018). Collectively, these seek to ensure that development, including extensions, is of high quality design, compatible with the scale and character of existing development and respects its townscape context.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR