



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by J Glasin RIBA SCA MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/25/3374221

Albion Court, Albion Place, Hammersmith and Fulham, London, W6 0QT

- 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 Avon Ground Rents Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2025/00382/FUL
 - The development proposed is erection of a one-storey extension to the 2 existing blocks on-site, to create 5 new flats (3 x 1 bedrooms and 2 x 2 bedrooms), associated cycle and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused for erection of a one-storey extension to the 2 existing blocks on-site, to create 5 new flats (3 x 1 bedrooms and 2 x 2 bedrooms), associated cycle and refuse storage.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Avon Ground Rents Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The appeal is against the non-determination of a planning application. The Council's submission indicates that they would have refused planning permission for reasons relating to design and visual amenity, and the absence of a signed legal agreement to remove residential car parking permits.
4. The appeal site has a planning history. The current proposal is a revised scheme intended to address the reasons for refusal of the earlier application. My decision is based on the scheme submitted with the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The site lies between Albion Court, King Street, and adjoining neighbouring buildings. The site is accessed from Albion Court, leading to King Street. The site sits adjacent to Hammersmith Town Hall Conservation Area (CA).

7. The surrounding buildings along Albion Place comprise a mix of uses, including offices, residential accommodation, and commercial hospitality premises. The adjoining buildings are of modern design but are simple and restrained in their architectural expression in terms of scale, massing and appearance. As with the appeal site, many were originally constructed for commercial office use, which is reflected in the modest yet coherent character of the area. The buildings are predominantly three and four storeys in height, with the exception of Holiday Inn Express hotel, which rises to five storeys in height. Owing to its scale, height and blunt form, the hotel appears visually prominent and conspicuous within the context of the immediate townscape.
8. External materials are mainly brick and render, while roof forms consist of pitched and flat roofs, with some mansard roofs present at top-floor level only.
9. The appeal site consists of three modern, detached residential buildings arranged around a central courtyard. Each block is three storeys in height and finished in a combination of brick, render and metal cladding. The buildings incorporate a mix of mansard and flat roof forms.
10. The Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) (Local Plan) seeks to create a high-quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context and heritage assets. The development proposed would create an additional floor to two of the existing building blocks for new residential units; Block 1 along Albion Place, and Block 2, located adjacent to 22 Albion Mews on the courtyard side. Both blocks would be extended upwards, continuing the existing façade, with some balconies set back from the building line.
11. Block 1 would incorporate a two-storey mansard roof across three elevations of the building, featuring recessed balconies on two sides, and a brick gable wall on the third. Similarly, Block 2 would introduce a two-storey mansard roof to all four elevations, with balconies set back on one side. The additions would significantly alter the overall scale, massing and appearance of the buildings, resulting in forms that would not relate well to the surrounding streetscene and local townscape. In particular, the substantial double-height mansard element proposed, finished in dark metal cladding, would appear visually dominant and incongruous, forming a discordant feature within the local built environment. Even when viewed in the context of the Holiday Inn, notwithstanding the scale and height of that building, the development would appear out of scale and would result in a further erosion of the small-scale character of the townscape. Consequently, the development would fail to respond positively to the existing character of Albion Place.
12. The Local Plan states that alterations and extensions should be of a high standard in design, and compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting.
13. The development proposed would substantially increase the depth, height, and massing of the building, which would result in a visually heavy and overbearing mansard roof element. Unlike a traditional mansard, which tapers back, the proposed form would add significant volume to the upper storeys. As a result, it would appear out of scale with the building, and disproportionate in relation to the established built form of Albion Place. The enlarged mansard element would introduce an imbalanced feature in this particular location and setting. Consequently, the form, scale and bulk of the proposed mansard would fail to

respond positively to the character of the existing building, nor the neighbouring properties and their setting.

14. Whilst the proposed development would increase the existing capacity of the site, for the reasons set out above the design of the scheme would fail to respond positively to the established character of this section of Albion Place. As such, the development would be contrary to Policy D3 of the Local Plan, which seeks to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach and requires development to respond to local character by identifying and respecting the special and valued features of a place, including heritage assets and architectural characteristics that contribute to local distinctiveness.
15. Taking all matters into account, I conclude that the adverse effects of the development on the character and appearance of the local area, would result in clear conflict with the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (NPPF) and Local Plan. The adverse effects would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. As a consequence, the development would conflict with the NPPF, Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Local Plan and Policy D3 of the London Plan, all of which seek to ensure a high quality urban environment that is compatible with the local character and respects the setting.

Other Matters

16. The Council has indicated that its reasons for refusal would have included the absence of a signed legal agreement removing residential car parking permit entitlement. The appellant has subsequently submitted a Unilateral Undertaking to remove residential car parking permit entitlement. However, since the appeal is dismissed, there is no need to consider this matter further.
17. The appellant has referred to precedents involving buildings with double mansards and has drawn comparison with other appeal decisions. However, the examples cited relate to new build, whereas the proposal before me involves an extension upwards of an existing building. These precedents are not directly comparable. Accordingly, I have determined this case on the basis of the specific circumstances of this particular site, its context, and its setting.
18. Whilst the site is not in the CA, the development would be within the setting of the CA. It would be visible from Kings Street, from certain viewpoints along the Albion Place and King Street, and from passing trains from the elevated London Underground line. However, given the restricted viewpoints and distance from the CA, any adverse effect would be limited. For these reasons, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, and would not cause harm to the setting or significance of the nearby listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets.
19. Both the London Plan and the Borough's Local Plan take a positive approach to the delivery of additional housing, and I recognise that the scheme would make a contribution towards meeting local housing needs. The provision of five new residential units therefore carries positive weight in favour of the development. However, the overall benefit would be limited due to the modest number of units proposed.

20. I acknowledge the appellant's dissatisfaction with the way in which the application was handled by the Council. The appellant engaged in pre-application advice for the scheme and considered, on the basis of the advice, that the officers were likely to recommend approval. The Council, however, are not bound by the officers pre-application advice in making their final decision and as such are material considerations to which I can attach only limited weight in making this decision.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development is not acceptable, and it would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision other than in accordance with the plan. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

J Glasin

INSPECTOR