



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/25/3373654

78 Gowan Avenue, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 6RG

- 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 Alicia Cardale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2025/00138/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extend existing loft conversion to include dormer over front roof slope, plus dormer over part of rear addition roof, plus raise ridge by 300mm, plus remove front pediment'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front and rear roof extension, involving an increase in the ridge height by 300mm; a rear extension at second floor level, over part of the existing back addition; the removal of the existing pediment to the front elevation at roof level; and the retention of the already built ground floor side and rear extension to the side of the existing outrigger at 78 Gowan Avenue, Hammersmith and Fulham, London SW6 6RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/00138/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A01 Rev-1, A02 Rev-1, A03 Rev-1, A04 Rev-1, A05 Rev-1, A06 Rev-1, A07 Rev-1, A08 Rev-1 and A09 Rev-1.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The roof of the extensions hereby permitted shall not be converted into, or used as, a terrace or other open amenity space.
 - 4) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, the bedroom window at second floor level in the side elevation as depicted on drawing nos. A05 Rev-1 and A08 Rev-1 shall be fitted with obscure glass to a minimum level of obscurity equivalent to Pilkington Texture Glass Level 3, and shall be non-opening and fixed shut to a height of 1.7m above the finished floor level. The window shall be permanently retained as such thereafter.

Procedural Matter and Background

2. The description in my banner is taken from the application form, but differs from that in the Council's decision and the appellant's statement of case ('the SoC'). Having regard to part 4 of the Council's delegated report, and paragraph 2.2 of the SoC, the description was amended during the consideration of the proposal to include an existing ground floor extension which had been constructed without planning permission ('the GFE').
3. In September 2025, planning permission was granted at the host property for a front and rear roof extension, involving an increase in the ridge height by 300mm, a rear extension at second floor level over part of the existing back addition, and the removal of an existing pediment to the front elevation at roof level ('the approved scheme')¹. The approved scheme is the same as those elements in the scheme before me.
4. Consequently, whilst I have considered the impact of this scheme as a whole, and having regard to cumulative impacts, I have focused on the GFE.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers with particular regard to the availability of natural light to, and the outlook from, 76 Gowan Avenue ('No 76').

Reasons

Living conditions

6. The pre-existing floor plans show that No 78 had a two storey rear outrigger and a short single storey flat roofed projection which were set in from the boundary with the neighbouring terraced house at No 76. As I observed on my visit, the space between that structure and the boundary has been filled in by the GFE.
7. The Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (the SPD)¹ advises at HS7 ii) that an extension to the side of an original back addition shall not exceed 2 metres in height on the boundary with the neighbouring property.
8. No 76 has been divided into flats. It has a similar two storey outrigger to No 78, which includes ground floor windows and a glazed door which face the common boundary across a narrow side space. However, I understand that they serve non-habitable rooms in that property's ground floor flat. The flat also has a ground floor rear-facing bedroom window. The outlook from there, which was already enclosed by that property's own outrigger to one side, and by a boundary fence and No 78's outrigger to the other, has become more so as a result of the GFE.
9. However, that bedroom window, which is large and set in slightly from the boundary, retains an outlook straight down No 76's side space towards that property's main garden area beyond. Moreover, although the GFE is deep and abuts the side boundary, it has a limited single storey height which, although taller than advised by the SPD, is not substantially higher than boundary walls and fences which are prevalent in the area.

¹ Ref: 2025/01982/FUL

10. As illustrated by Figure 2 in the SoC, and as I observed on my visit, the outlook from other ground floor rear windows in the area is often constrained by boundary treatment or extensions, some of which fill the space to the side of, or project beyond, an original two storey outrigger.
11. Based on the pre-existing drawings, the GFE fills the gap to the side of No 78 but does not result in a deeper projection into its rear garden. Thus, compared to the pre-existing situation, the gap between the building and the plot's rear boundary wall, which the principal parties say measures 3.3 metres, remains unchanged.
12. This is a densely developed urban area, where a limited outlook and some degree of enclosure is not uncommon. In that context, and having regard to its single storey height and the particular site circumstances, the GFE has not had a significant impact on the outlook from No 76, nor on the outlook from, and availability of natural light to, the nearest properties on Wardo Avenue to the rear.
13. Finally, given the GFE's height, and No 76's light coloured finish, I am not persuaded, on the basis of the available evidence, that it has caused a harmful reduction in natural light for those occupiers.
14. The other elements of this proposal are the same as the approved scheme, and I have no cogent reason to disagree with the Council's assessment that they would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity.
15. Summing up, the scheme does not have a harmfully adverse effect on neighbouring occupiers' living conditions. Whilst it does not accord with the guidance in the SPD, it does not conflict with those parts of Policies DC4 and HO11 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan 2018, which set out that extensions and alterations should take account of the amenities of neighbouring properties, and should not result in a harmful impact on the occupiers' privacy, light and outlook.

Other matters

16. Given the diverse and evolving form and appearance of the properties on Gowan Avenue, and having regard to the relatively small differences compared to the approved scheme and the proposed use of matching materials, I agree with the Council that the proposal would not harmfully impact the character or appearance of No 78 or the area.

Conditions and Conclusion

17. I have considered suggested conditions against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. As the GFE has already been built, the standard time limit for commencement is not appropriate. In the interests of certainty, and as other parts of the scheme have not been completed, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, a condition is also necessary requiring that it be faced with matching materials.
18. Finally, in order to protect neighbouring occupiers from harmful overlooking and loss of privacy, conditions are necessary to prevent the use of the approved roof space as an outdoor amenity area, and requiring that the second floor side facing window be obscurely glazed and partially non-opening.

19. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR