



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2025

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/25/3359339

42 Stevenage Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 6HA

- 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 Mrs Sarah Blackstock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
- The application Ref is 2024/02172/FUL.
- The development proposed is formation of vehicle crossover and associated reduction in height of front boundary wall to provide a single off-street parking space.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for formation of vehicle crossover and associated reduction in height of front boundary wall to provide a single off-street parking space at 42 Stevenage Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 6HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/02172/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant's submissions include a parking survey report which was not before the Council when it made its decision. Whilst the parking survey report evolves the appellant's submissions in support of the appeal, the proposed development itself has not been amended. I am satisfied that the parking survey report submitted does not substantially or fundamentally alter the proposed development.
3. As the Householder Appeal Service procedure is being followed, I am mindful that the Council do not have the right to submit an appeal statement and that the likes of local residents are not provided the opportunity to submit further comments.
4. However, the Council was offered the opportunity to challenge the appeal procedure following receipt of the appellant's submissions, and it was also invited to provide comment on any evidence it deemed materially different to that provided at the application stage. No such comments are before me. In respect of local residents, I note that no comments were received during the determination of the planning application. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that no parties would be prejudiced by me taking the parking survey report into account and that it is procedurally fair to accept its submission. Therefore, in my decision, I have had regard to it.
5. The appeal site is situated within the Bishop's Park Conservation Area (the CA), and listed buildings are located within the local area. As a result, in making my decision, I have had special regard to sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- The effects of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area including its effects upon the CA;
- The parking and highways related effects of the proposed development with particular regard to safety and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; and
- The effects of the proposed development upon the risks posed by surface water flooding.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The CA contains the open and verdant landscape of Bishop's Park itself which includes some historical landmarks such as Fulham Palace. The CA's riverside position permits some extensive and impressive panoramic views. In some contrast with these more open qualities, the CA also contains concentrations of Victorian era residential properties arranged in a grid-iron pattern. Altogether, these facets mean that the significance of the CA as a whole principally stems from its architectural, historic and archaeological interest.
8. The appeal site contains a traditionally designed residential property located on the corner of two of the CA's formally arranged streets. Being very reflective of those parts of the CA which exhibit that Victorian era residential character, the appeal site contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
9. Within the CA there are streets, or parts of streets, where a particularly strong sense of enclosure is formed by virtue of a consistent approach to front-of-plot boundaries and an absence of many large breaks within them. Ellerby Street provides an example of this, and the street trees which line the road, contribute further to this sense of enclosure and of an ordered street scene. Similarly, on Bishop's Park Road, I noted a strong and consistent presence of front hedgerow boundaries. These boundary and street scene features are distinctive, and they contribute positively to the character and appearance of the grid-iron streets within the CA.
10. However, in some contrast, I find that Stevenage Road exhibits a less consistent approach to front boundaries and, generally, a weaker sense of enclosure and order. In part, this is derived from much of one side of Stevenage Road being lined by Bishop's Park and Craven Cottage rather than by residential properties. It is also derived from Stevenage Road's quite numerous crossovers and varied breaks in front plot boundaries. In the vicinity of the appeal site, this generates on Stevenage Road a street scene with more variety, a less well-defined approach to front boundaries and, overall, a weaker sense of enclosure in comparison to some neighbouring streets.
11. Although a 2.4 metre (m) wide section would be demolished, most of the host property's front boundary wall would be retained. Therefore, upon completion of

the proposed development, the host property's front plot would still retain a quite strong sense of enclosure. Where the wall would be lowered, traditionally designed railings would be installed. Similar railings are prevalent in the area. Consequently, the railings proposed would be very reflective of the area, and they would exude a high-quality design.

12. Some of the host property's front garden plantings would be removed as a result of the proposed development. However, the appellant has confirmed that the site's trees would be retained, and this could be ensured through the imposition of a condition. The retention of these features, including the purple leaved plum the subject of a tree preservation order, would ensure that landscape features, which would soften the effects of the development, would endure within the street scene.
13. Therefore, owing to the proposal's particular design and the prevailing features and aesthetic of Stevenage Road, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area, and the character and appearance of the CA as a whole would be preserved. As a result, the proposal complies with Policies OS5, DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan, 2018 (HFLP) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan, 2021.
14. In summary, and amongst other matters, these Policies require development proposals to be of a high standard of design which protect, respect and enhance the townscape, including garden spaces and features, and which conserve the significance of heritage assets. The proposal also complies with guidance within the Council's Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document February 2018 (the SPD) which includes that which seeks to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas and protect their trees and open spaces.

The parking and highways related effects

15. The appeal site is located beside the junction of Stevenage Road and Ellerby Street. The appeal site already has a vehicular access to Ellerby Street, but the evidence before me indicates that the drive served by it is of sub-standard dimensions which cannot cater for most modern cars. More generally, although some properties in the area are served by driveways, many are not, and on-street parking is a feature in the area within dedicated bays which are the subject of a controlled parking zone. The appeal site is within an area attributed a Transport for London Public Transport Accessibility Level of 2. Consequently, the appeal site is not within an area where access to public transport is particularly good.
16. Amongst the SPD's guidance are a series of transport related key principles. Of these, key principle TR23 specifically concerns developments which involve proposals for footway crossovers and forecourt and front garden parking such as that the subject of the appeal. The prescriptive guidance of TR23 is therefore a particularly relevant part of the SPD.
17. Amongst other criteria, key principle TR23 advises that crossovers should be a minimum of 10m from a road junction. The proposed crossover would be closer to the junction of Stevenage Road and Ellerby Street than this recommendation. However, on the corners of the junction, there are yellow line markings which will prohibit on-street parking from taking place. Therefore, where turning movements will take place at the junction, parked vehicles will be set-back aiding driver visibility. Stevenage Road benefits from some traffic calming features and, together

with the speed limit in force in the area and the presence of parked vehicles lining the road, I expect vehicle speeds are, on the whole, low.

18. These factors mean that users of both the proposed crossover, and of the junction adjacent, would have adequate visibility of one another and that movements on and off the proposed drive, and turnings at the junction, would all be able to take place safely.
19. The crossover would necessitate a crossfall toward the road. However, I have no reason to conclude that this would be carried out in a way that fails to minimise any level difference, or that the works within the highway would not be undertaken to appropriate standards of workmanship. Consequently, I have no reason to conclude that the pavement would be left with a surface that would be difficult to navigate or unsafe to use.
20. For these reasons, I find that the access arrangements which would result from the proposed development would be safe.
21. There are aspects of the appellant's parking survey report which somewhat undermine its credibility. Firstly, it includes draft watermarks. Secondly, appendices A and B are missing. I also note that the parking surveys themselves were undertaken at 01:00am and not between 03:00am and 05:00am which is recommended for overnight parking capacity surveys by key principle TR3 of the SPD.
22. Nevertheless, the parking surveys were still undertaken in the early hours of the morning when I expect parking levels in the area would be higher than most other times. The results of the survey present that roughly half of the parking spaces within the survey area were free and available when surveyed. When I conducted my visit, plenty of free parking spaces could be found in the surroundings to the appeal site, including on Stevenage Road, albeit my visit was conducted during the day, not the overnight period.
23. Overall though, I have no compelling evidence before me which counters the appellant's parking survey results or which indicates to me that they are inaccurate. On the basis of all the evidence available to me, I find that a high degree of parking stress does not prevail on Stevenage Road nor in the local area, and that parking stress levels are below the 80% level recommended by SPD key principle TR23.
24. This means that, even though the shortening of the on-street parking bay by 4m would result in the loss of a parking space, the consequences upon other residents and their ability to find parking spaces would be limited and not harmful. I am also mindful that the occupiers of the host property would be competing less for available parking spaces.
25. The Council refer to a requirement for the appellant to enter into a planning obligation in order to surrender any parking permits they may have. However, I have been provided with no evidence of any policy basis for this. Furthermore, given my conclusions on parking stress above, even if such parking permits were not surrendered, I fail to see that the outcome of this would result in harmful effects upon parking in the area or, in turn, the living conditions of other local residents.
26. For the reasons I have given, I conclude that the parking and highways related effects of the proposed development would be acceptable with the proposal giving

rise to no effects prejudicial to highway safety or which would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Consequently, the proposed development complies with Policies HO11, T1, T4 and T6 of the HFLP. In summary, and amongst other matters, these Policies seek to promote safe environments and sustainable transport and seek to ensure that developments do not prejudice highway effectiveness and safety across the hierarchy of the Borough's roads. These Policies also require developments to conform to parking standards and respect the principles of good neighbourliness including in relation to vehicular parking. Despite the proposal not complying with every single criterion within the SPD's guidance, I nevertheless, find that, overall, the proposal complies with the SPD's transport advice on ensuring appropriate design in highways related terms.

Surface water flood risk

27. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (the FRA) asserts that the site is not within an area of particular risk from surface water flooding, and it includes an extract from the Environment Agency's Surface Water Flood Map in support of this assertion. The annotations on the map make the extract somewhat unclear, and I am also mindful that caution must be exercised when using the Environment Agency's Surface Water Flood Map in respect of small parcels of land or individual buildings. Even so, I have no substantive evidence before me which demonstrates to me that the appeal site is particularly susceptible to surface water flooding or that the assertions made within the FRA are inaccurate.
28. The FRA confirms that it is proposed to form the driveway using a permeable solution. Provided that this was delivered, even though the plans show that areas of a planted garden would be replaced with the driveway, impermeable surfaces within the property's front plot would not increase.
29. A condition can ensure the provision of a permeable driveway solution. With the imposition of this condition, I am satisfied that surface water run-off would be adequately managed and no increase in the risks posed by surface water flooding would arise as a result of the proposed development.
30. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policies CC3 and CC4 of the HFLP. These Policies seek to minimise current and future flood risk and require the submission of flood risk assessments which assess flood risk and, as necessary, propose flood prevention measures. They also set out that development proposals must manage surface water run-off with new outdoor parking areas and hard standing surfaces designed so that they are rainwater permeable. The proposal also complies with guidance within the SPD which is very reflective of some of the aforementioned development plan policy content.

Other Matters

31. Farther to the north-west, on the opposite side of Stevenage Road, is the grade II listed Office to South of Grandstand at Fulham Football Club. Apart from forming a part of the CA, Bishop's Park itself is a grade II listed park and garden, and it contains other designated heritage assets including the grade I listed Fulham Palace.
32. Comprising of the formation of a vehicle crossover and associated works to a boundary wall, the scale of the development proposed is modest. Owing to this modest scale, and the appeal site's separation from them, the proposed

development would result in no harm to the various designated heritage assets I have referenced above.

Conditions

33. The Council has provided a schedule of suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment upon them. I have considered this schedule in the light of the tests for the imposition of conditions set out within the National Planning Policy Framework and the content of the Planning Practice Guidance. Consequently, my final suite of conditions differs from that suggested to me for the reasons I give below. In the interests of clarity, precision and to avoid duplication, this includes some adjustments to wording.
34. Condition 1 sets out the standard time limitation. Condition 2 is necessary to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. Conditions 3 and 4 are necessary to clarify the use of external materials and that the appeal site's trees are to be retained in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Although some garden plantings would be lost to the proposed development, given the trees to be retained and that the proposed plans show that the remains of the front garden would still include planted areas, securing a proposed landscaping scheme via condition is not necessary or proportionate in this case and, therefore, such a requirement does not figure in my schedule.
35. My third main issue makes clear the purpose of, and need for, condition 5. In the interests of promoting sustainable travel and local air quality, I have imposed condition 6.

Conclusion

36. The proposed development accords with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

H Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

Location Plan dated 29 August 2024
Proposed Front Elevation 24-426-SK04 Rev A
Proposed Crossover & Visibility Splays (Option 2) 24-426-SK02 Rev A
- 3) The external materials used in the formation of the modified front boundary wall hereby permitted shall comprise of brick and painted render and black-painted metal railings which match the details shown on the approved plans, and the materials of the existing front boundary wall.
- 4) The trees identified as T1-T8 (inclusive) on the submitted Tree Constraints Plan shall be retained and shall not be cut down, uprooted or otherwise destroyed.
- 5) None of the development hereby permitted, apart from the demolition of the section of front boundary wall, shall take place until details of the proposed driveway's permeable construction have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The details shall include:
 - plans and sections which demonstrate the permeable make-up of the driveway's surface and sub-base layers;
 - a maintenance schedule for the permeable drivewayThereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the permeable driveway shall be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) None of the development hereby permitted, apart from the demolition of the section of front boundary wall, shall take place until details of the provision of an active electric vehicle charging point (minimum 7kW) to serve the driveway hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The driveway shall not be brought into use until the electric vehicle charging point has been installed in accordance with the approved details and, thereafter, the electric vehicle charging point shall be retained.