



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2025

by **T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/25/3362552

331 Fulham Palace Road, Hammersmith & Fulham, London SW6 6TE

- 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 Dr Parham c/o Betapharma Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2024/00968/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey glazed extension to the front elevation at ground floor level, following removal of existing shop frontage; erection of a single storey rear in-fill extension at ground floor level to existing courtyard area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the decision notice which has also been used on the appeal form as this more accurately describes the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, and;
 - flood risk with particular regard to surface water drainage and water efficiency measures.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site relates to a mid-terrace, ground-floor commercial premises with a pitched roof to the front elevation, located within a designated neighbourhood parade. It is not a listed building. Whilst some of the units have front canopies, raised patio areas and low-level front boundaries, none of the commercial units have enclosed front extensions. The ground floor units within the parade exhibit a consistent setback of their front façades from the highway, and this consistency contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. At the front of the property, a single-storey flat-roofed fully glazed extension on three sides is proposed. This extension, in the middle of a terrace, would extend the full width of the shop frontage and protrude significantly out into the forecourt area. Whilst it would appear subservient in scale, due to its design and location, it

would appear as a boxy, intrusive and incongruous addition to the streetscene and would appear at odds with the consistent building line of the surrounding properties within the parade that face Fulham Palace Road. This would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

6. I acknowledge that the existing architectural detailing on the host property would be retained. However, even with the use of only glazing, the boxy, flat-roofed form of the front extension would nevertheless detract from the architectural detailing on the host property and fail to complement the existing building profile.
7. The adjacent property at No 333 has a fully glazed side extension, and there would be some similarities between that and the appeal proposal in terms of its design and materials. However, No 333 is a corner property with the side extension set back behind the front elevation of that property. It therefore does not appear as prominent as the proposal would. Moreover, the side extension at No 333 replaced a previous conservatory which had originally been approved in the late 1980's. Taking the above into account, the circumstances and location of the extension at No 333 are not comparable to the appeal scheme and as such I give this limited weight.
8. No concerns have been raised with regard to the rear single storey infill extension on this main issue. From what I have observed and given its siting to the rear, with limited visibility from the street scene, I have no reason to come to a different view.
9. For the reasons above, the front extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (LP). Taken together, these require high quality development that improves the quality of the built environment. It would also conflict with Policy DC5 of the LP and Principle SD1 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD), which together, seek to encourage high quality shopfronts that respect the age and architectural style of the building involved.

Flood risk

10. The appeal site is within flood zone 3. A Flood Risk Assessment dated October 2024, was submitted as part of the application. This confirmed that the site is at a very low risk of flooding from surface water sources and that there would be no increase in the rate of surface water discharge from the proposal from the site in its current configuration. I see no reason to come to an alternate view. On my visit, I observed that the rear yard was concreted over, suggesting it is of limited value in controlling surface water runoff and indicates that the proposal, which is limited in scale would not lead to a worsening of the situation as confirmed in the FRA, with no substantive evidence to suggest otherwise. Moreover, I note that the appellant is willing to provide additional water efficiency measures such as a water butt. I am satisfied that the implementation of such water efficiency measures could be conditioned should I have been minded to allow the appeal.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that there would be no conflict with Policy CC3 which requires a flood risk assessment to outline mitigation measures where relevant, or with Key Principle FR1 of the SPD which requires a FRA. The proposal would also accord with Policy CC4 of the LP which requires the inclusion of sustainable drainage measures.

Other Matter

12. I note that there would be no adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, a lack of harm is a neutral consideration and does not alter my conclusions in respect of character and appearance above.

Conclusion

13. I am satisfied that there would be no adverse effect on flood risk. However, I have found the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This draws the proposal into conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR