
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/24/3356013

7 Parfrey Street, First Floor Flat, Hammersmith and Fulham W6 9EW

- 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 Camilla Weston against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2024/02089/FUL.
 - The development proposed is conversion of second floor rear flat roof into amenity terrace with obscured glass balustrade/screen for privacy and security; removal of sash window and replacement with glazed doors to terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Because the appeal site lies in the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA), I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCAA).

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area including the Crabtree Conservation Area (CA), within which the site lies; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with particular regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a flat located on the first and second floors within a property in a residential terrace. The property has a two-storey rear outrigger with flat roof. It has been further extended by a ground floor rear extension, a rear roof extension and extension over half the rear addition. The wider area comprises similar residential terraces, with two storey outriggers. Views of the rear outriggers in this part of the terrace are limited by the built form along Fulham Palace Road (A219).
5. The CA covers a large area of residential terraces, the commercial uses on Fulham Palace Road, the historic riverside at Crabtree Wharf and Fulham

Cemetery. Its significance is derived from the Victorian and Edwardian residential development laid out in a rectilinear street pattern with numerous streets running at right angles to the river. The Crabtree Conservation Area Character Profile (1999) refers to Parfrey Street comprising five terrace types, with nos 2 to 68 retaining their decorative glazing bars to the upper sash windows and unusual tuck pointing. The appeal site retains its original appearance to the front and therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. I observed that despite some extensions of limited depth, the outriggers near the appeal site retain their original form. I noted that a neighbouring property has erected a shed on the roof of an outrigger, however with this exception the roof lines have an uninterrupted, open appearance.
7. The proposed privacy screen would wrap around the remaining roof area creating an enclosed appearance. Whilst this would be obscured glass and allow for light to pass through, it would create a solid form along the length of the outrigger. Although it would be stepped down from the dormer extension, due to its height it would dominate the appearance of the roof. Whilst the submitted evidence shows there are some examples of existing roof terraces, these are modest in scale and do not extend across the entire depth of the outrigger, which would not be the case here. The proposal would span the remaining depth of the outrigger which would interrupt the open appearance of the run of outriggers. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has referred me to the recent permission granted for a 1.7m high privacy screen at 38 Parfrey Street. Although I do not have all the details of the case, I note that the Delegated Report Template refers to the lightweight appearance of the screen which ensures that it would not dominate the rear of the wider terrace group. This is not the case with the appeal site for the reasons I have outlined above.

Heritage balance

9. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building which contributes positively to the CA. I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where harm is identified to the significance of designated heritage assets and their setting, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The proposal would provide external outdoor space for use by the appellant, who uses the property to work from home, however this would be a private benefit. I attribute limited weight to the public benefits of the proposal, which is insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA.
11. I conclude that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the LBCAA, paragraph 210 of the Framework, and conflicts with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (LP), which amongst other things seeks to create a high quality urban environment, ensure that alterations are compatible with the scale and character of existing development and conserve the significance of the borough's historic environment.

Living conditions

12. The adjoining property, 9 Parfrey Street, has a two-storey outrigger with windows which appear to serve habitable rooms on the side facing towards the appeal site at ground and first floor levels. The height and depth of the proposed screen would reduce the angle of unobstructed visibility by more than 15% even when accounting for the distance between. Therefore, the proposed glazed screen would reduce the outlook from the first-floor rear window of No. 9. Because of the relationship between the side facing windows of No 9 to the existing outrigger the Council do not consider that the impact of the proposal would have substantially greater impact. I concur with this finding.
13. In conclusion, the proposal would cause unacceptable living conditions for the residents of No 9 with particular regards to outlook. It thereby conflicts with Policies DC1, DC4 and HO11 of the LP which amongst other things seeks to protect existing residential amenities including outlook.

Other Matters

14. The appeal site adjoins the outbuildings associated with the Melcombe Primary and Infants School, a Grade II Listed Building. The property is described in the listing as a three-storey property constructed of red brick, buff terracotta with red tiled roof. It is an unusually elaborate, well preserved example of the school work of T J Bailey. Neither party has raised concerns in relation to the potential impact on this listed building. Based on my observations the proposal would not adversely harm the setting of this building due to its scale and presence of the intervening building.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR