



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2025 by A Conteh

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/24/3357424

59 Chesson Road, London W14 9QS

- 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 Simon Rutson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01837/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of second floor rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a second floor rear extension at 59 Chesson Road, London, W14 9QS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/01837/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos CR PA 02 Rev A and CR PA 03 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Turneville and Chesson Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The CA derives considerable significance from its architectural style of simple yet picturesque three-storey brick terraces. The Victorian-style dwellings bear a sense of uniformity across their front elevations through their shared detailing of concrete steps, wrought iron railings and bay windows. The visibility of the rear of terraces is generally limited, and they have a more varied style compared with the plain and cohesive appearance of the streetscape, so make a much more limited contribution to the significance of the CA.

5. While the front of the appeal property shares the characteristic form, detailing and dormer found on many other properties in the area, the rear has been significantly altered by a roof extension continuing the line of the rear wall upwards, such that the original rear roof slope is obscured. Consequently, the rear of the appeal property does not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
6. The additions of front and rear dormers dominate the roofscape of Chesson Road, creating a new rhythm to the terrace beyond the original gable roofs. Two and three storey rear extensions are common throughout the rear of properties on those parts of Chesson Road and Bramber Road visible from the rear of the appeal site. While many are on top of original rear outriggers, they are not homogeneous in materials, architectural details or scale.
7. The appeal development would add height within the footprint of the existing outrigger, but its unchanged depth would limit its additional visual impact in the small gap where the rear of the appeal property can be glimpsed between No 61B and No 65. The rear elevation is difficult to see in longer views from Normand Road due to the distance and intervening vegetation.
8. As the proposal would be no wider than the existing outrigger, part of the original rear elevation would remain visible. Furthermore, the rear dormers on adjacent properties, seen with the roof extension on the host dwelling, break up the visual mass of the roofscape. Combined with the limited depth and width of the proposal, this would ensure that, although it would extend above the original eaves line, the proposed development would still appear subordinate to the property and wider terrace. As a result, the appeal site would not appear overdeveloped but rather in keeping with the general scale and massing of existing built forms in the area.
9. Many comparable rear built forms in the terrace do not extend to the roof, however there are a significant number of rear dormers and great variety in extension design and scale across the rear elevations of this and neighbouring terraces. I also saw that several extensions break the original eaves line with roof terraces. In this context and given the existing significant change to the rear roof slope of the appeal property, the proposed development would be sympathetic to the mixed architectural character of the rear of the terrace and would not appear as a discordant or jarring feature. Therefore, overall, it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would comply with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) which promote respect for surrounding architectural character and preservation of the CA. In the same regard, the proposal satisfies Key principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) insofar as they seek to ensure development is sympathetic to its context and respects the CA.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would be visible from neighbouring properties, and I appreciate that it would be a further extension to the existing dwelling. It would however be set away from the boundary with its attached neighbour, and of modest size and lower in height than the existing roof extension. Therefore, it would not appear unduly prominent or dominant in the outlook from neighbouring properties. Any additional

shading towards neighbours would only be for a short time towards the middle of the day and would be very limited given the separation distance. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

12. All proposed developments are considered on their own merits and in relation to their particular context, therefore allowing this scheme would not automatically set a precedent for similar development on other, different, dwellings.

Conditions

13. Conditions relating to the time limit on commencement and the development being in accord with plans are necessary in the interest of certainty. To preserve the appearance of the CA I also recommend a condition ensuring materials on the rear extension to match the host dwelling given that, although limited in visibility, it is more visible than other rear extensions across the terrace.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

A Conteh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR