



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by K Dryden BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/25/3371649

7A Wood Lane, Hammersmith and Fulham, London W12 7DP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr E Bucciol against the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application reference is 2025/00736/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the infill of first floor extension to 7A Wood Lane connected to 1A MacFarlane Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to a planning application that was not determined by the Council within the prescribed period. I note that, had the Council issued a decision, it would have refused planning permission. In establishing the main issues, I have had regard to the submissions of both parties.
3. At my site visit, I observed that No 7A Wood Lane is located on the junction of Wood Lane and MacFarlane Road. Adjacent to this building are terraced properties with separate access and house number signs, including No 7B and No 7C. The building that is the subject of the proposed development is numbered No 7C. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans.
4. The Council have stated that the appeal site has planning and enforcement history and that works were not carried out in accordance with an earlier consent¹. The development proposed at that time included, 'the erection of a front and side roof extensions including an extension on top of the main roof; excavation of front and side gardens to form lightwells in connection with the creation of a new basement in connection with the provision of 2 x self-contained studio flats and 1 x two bedroom self-contained flat; installation of new entrance door with steps and surround to replace the existing window, installation of a new window to replace the existing entrance door, step and surround at ground floor level to the front elevation'.
5. A subsequent variation of condition application² which sought to make changes to the above, approved, planning consent was refused. The changes included,

¹ 2019/01111/FUL

² 2020/00667/VAR

‘Demolition and rebuild of previously existing building; alterations to the colour of the facing brickwork; changes to the design, opening style and material of all fenestration and the main entrance door; a new brick boundary wall; increased overall height of the building and changes to the proportions and form of the mansard roof’.

6. Regardless of what has been constructed to date, and mindful of the site’s extensive planning history, I have determined this appeal based on the plans before me. Any works carried out not in accordance with approved plans would be a matter between the Council and the appellant.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
- whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for adjoining occupiers, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site is situated within a vibrant mixed commercial and residential area. The substantial Westfield shopping centre complex is located to the Northwest. The wider locality contains a number of attractive period buildings that contribute positively to the established character and visual interest of the area. The immediate context is defined by Victorian terraced properties, typically arranged in consistent building lines with narrow plot sizes.
9. Number 7A Wood Lane (No 7A) occupies a prominent corner property, fronting MacFarlane Road. The building is constructed in red brick with an ornate Dutch gable roof. During my site visit, the front elevation was clearly visible when approaching MacFarlane Road and is a prominent element when looking south along Wood Lane.
10. The Shepherd’s Bush Conservation Area (CA) lies in close proximity to the appeal site, with the designation encompassing the properties on the opposite side of Wood Lane, which face the flank elevation of the appeal property. The heritage significance of the CA is derived from the architectural quality of its built form. Due to its close siting and visual interest, No 7A makes a positive contribution to the setting and significance of the CA. The proposed two storey infill extension would be located within MacFarlane Road, where the building line is set back from both the road and No 7A, such that it would not be noticeable in views from either within or towards the CA. I therefore find the proposal to be set sufficiently far from the edge of the CA for its setting and significance not to be adversely affected.
11. The proposed extension at first and second floor level would infill the area above the existing ground floor element of No 7A, fronting MacFarlane Road, resulting in a continuous terrace of properties of similar height. During my site visit, it was apparent that the characteristic gaps in the built form are an established and attractive feature of the southern section of the road, providing visual relief within the street scene. This is evident at the Southwest corner of MacFarlane Road,

where there is separation distance between Units 2B, 2C, 2D and 2E of MacFarlane Road and the adjacent residential properties. In addition, directly opposite the site, the buildings on the northern side of the road are separated by a single-storey garage. In this context, the scale and massing of the proposal would appear visually oppressive and would erode the sense of openness that contributes positively to the character of the locality.

12. Furthermore, the building line steps back from the properties numbered as No 7A, 7B and 7C Wood Lane, which front MacFarlane Road. The existing ground floor addition, subject to the proposed two-storey infill extension, together with 1A MacFarlane Road, sit at an unusual angle to these properties and to the established building line on the southern side of MacFarlane Road. The scale and height of the proposed first and second storey extensions would exacerbate this awkward relationship and would appear at odds with both the established building line and the historic pattern of development, in which properties directly front the road.
13. The appellant contends that the street scene would not be affected as the elevation treatment and materials match the existing buildings. However, the detailed design of the proposal is not in dispute and does not overcome the harm I have identified arising from its scale, massing and siting within the street scene. Therefore, these comments do not lead me to a different view overall.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy DC1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (HFLP), which requires all development to create a high-quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context. Furthermore, it is contrary to Policy DC4 of the HFLP which requires a high standard of design in extensions to existing buildings, which are compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting.

Living Conditions – existing occupiers

15. The appeal site is in close proximity to several residential properties with rear-facing windows and small outdoor amenity spaces overlooking the back of the property. These include flats 1-6 at Westwood House, Wood Lane, in addition to No 10 Hopgood Street, which are sited in close arrangement to the appeal site, with the rear elevation of the proposal sharing a boundary with No 10 Hopgood Street.
16. The Council has referenced the guidance in Supplementary Planning Document, Planning Guidance, Key Principle HS6, Development, extensions and alterations – scale and massing (2018) (SPD). Although the SPD does not have the status of policy, this document is an important material consideration. Given the relationship between the proposal and the properties immediately adjacent to the south of the site, the Council have applied criterion (iii) which sets out that on-site judgment will be a determining factor in assessing the impact of the proposed extension on the existing amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
17. At my site visit, it was evident that the outlook from these properties is already constrained by the existing development along MacFarlane Road. The area above the existing ground floor extension at the appeal site provides the only break in what is otherwise a continuous three-storey built form along the boundary. The scale and massing of the proposed two-storey infill extension would significantly

worsen the living environment for these adjoining occupiers, creating an overbearing and oppressive relationship. The proposal would result in a three-storey mass of development extending across the full length of the shared boundary, to the detriment of the outlook for the immediately adjoining properties to the rear.

18. The planning application is not accompanied by a daylight and sunlight report, therefore a planning assessment is required. Given the orientation of the site, where the proposal lies to the north of the above properties, together with the existing massing along MacFarlane Road and the already constrained relationship between buildings, I do not find that the development would cause additional harm to the above residential occupiers through loss of daylight or sunlight.
19. A Representation has been received from a residential occupier to the north of the development, raising concerns about the impact of the proposal on the living conditions for immediate neighbours on MacFarlane Road, Wood Lane and Hopgood Street. In respect of neighbouring properties located to the north of MacFarlane Road, the buildings are separated from the site by the public highway. Given this separation, together with the scale and mass of the existing development, I do not find that the proposal would worsen their outlook or result in a loss of light.
20. Furthermore, while the extension would be visible to occupants of the terraced properties to the south of MacFarlane Road, beyond flats 1-6 at Westwood House, Wood Lane and No 10 Hopgood Street, the separation distance between the properties is sufficient to ensure that the development would not cause a harmful loss of outlook or create an increased sense of enclosure.
21. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions for adjoining occupiers at flats 1-6 at Westwood House, Wood Lane, in addition to No 10 Hopgood Street, with particular regard to loss of outlook. This is contrary to Policy DC4 and HO11 of the HFLP which, together, seek to ensure that, amongst other things, new development will demonstrate good neighbourliness.

Other Matters

22. The Council have stated that the quality of the plan drawings are considered to be fairly poor and would not give officers comfort that this would result in a high standard of development or could be implemented as shown on the plans. Whilst I acknowledge these concerns, the planning application has been validated by the Council, and I find that the plans submitted provide the information necessary to make an informed decision. In any event, had I found the proposal to be acceptable, planning conditions could have been used to require further details and ensure that the appearance of the building would be satisfactory.
23. The appellant has commented that there is a need for more residential development in the area, and the proposal will help to fulfil this need. However, the scheme would not result in a net gain of residential accommodation and instead comprises an extension to an existing property on the appeal site. Therefore, this consideration does not lead me to a different view overall.
24. Representations have been made by several interested parties, raising concern over parking provision and increased traffic in the local area as a result of the

development. Given the existing residential use of the property, and in the absence of substantive evidence demonstrating that any increase in occupancy would cause harm, I do not find the proposal to be problematic in this respect.

25. Furthermore, I find no harm arising from noise or disturbance associated with the proposal, nor from any potential increase in environmental impacts or carbon dioxide emissions, given the modest scale of the development. Additionally, I find no harm in relation to the size of the bedrooms or living conditions for future occupiers.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Dryden

INSPECTOR