



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/24/3352585

60 Norbroke Street, Hammersmith and Fulham, London W12 0QX

- 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 Mr Sanj Tacouri against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/02334/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two storey rear extension at ground and first floor level; re-positioning of 2 rooflights in the rear roof slope; replacement of 2 windows at ground and first floor levels to the rear elevation
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to Council's decision, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.
3. As the description of development varies between documents submitted, I have used that from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and accurate description of the proposal that has also been used by the appellant in their statement.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to the Old Oak and Wormholt Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a relatively small two storey mid-terraced house with good sized front and rear gardens, that sits within a short terrace in a street and local area made up of similar terraced properties. The local area was originally developed as planned estates of simple but well designed and proportioned houses in a cottage style during and after the Great War. The significance of these terraced properties and the townscape of estates has been recognised through the designation of the CA.

6. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
7. The proposals include a centrally positioned part one/part two storey rear extension that would not extend to the full width of the appeal dwelling. The ground floor of the proposed extension would be wider than the first floor, with a flat roofed part towards the shared side passage between the appeal dwelling and its adjoining neighbour on that side. The proposed extension would project approximately 3 metres rearward from the existing rear elevation. The first floor element would have a hipped roof form, which would meet the existing rear roof slope below the level of the roof ridge of the main house.
8. The appeal dwelling, along with most houses in the estate appear to have limited alterations, with little evidence of extension, particularly at first floor level. This has resulted in the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part appearing as part of a group of properties that demonstrate a consistent and rigorous architectural form and urban design.
9. Due to its scale, height, bulk and massing, the proposal would interrupt the rear building line of the terrace of which it forms part and would appear incongruous in this context. In views of the rear of the appeal dwelling, this would result in the proposed extension appearing as a bulky and dominating addition to the appeal dwelling.
10. This would also detract from the existing homogeneity of massing and rhythm of properties in the terrace and in the group of terraces in the immediate local area. This would be disruptive to the consistency of plan and form of these properties and the distinctive layout and pattern of development that makes a major contribution to the significance of the CA.
11. For these reasons, the proposal would not accord with Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018). these seek development that is sympathetic to the character of their context and positively contribute to the townscape of conservation areas.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area, as well harm to the significance of the CA. This would conflict with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018). Collectively, these seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, respects its townscape context and has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. The harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part, and the streetscape of the local area would be substantial, although the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.

14. The proposal, by increasing the size of the appeal dwelling and providing an additional bedroom and living space, would benefit existing and potential future occupiers, this does not, however, constitute a substantial public benefit. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA, and. In general, planning decisions should be made in the wider public interest. I consider that these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
15. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR