

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3167414

5 Burlington Lodge Studios, 48 Rigault Road, London SW6 4JJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rolf Von Pfefer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/04598/FUL, dated 19 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "extension to roof level extension and front gable extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Fulham Park Gardens Conservation Area and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property includes a mix of studio and living accommodation with the latter arranged over 2 floors either side of a double height space. It forms part of Burlington Lodge Studios, which comprises studio and office space, and is set away from the street and accessed via a courtyard. Burlington Lodge Studios is located within the Fulham Park Gardens Conservation Area and is designated as a Building of Townscape Merit. The positive contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is a matter to which I attach significant weight.
 4. Planning permission has been granted recently for development that would primarily infill the valley between the 2 parallel pitched roofs to enable the formation of additional space on an upper level (Ref: 2016/03754/FUL). I recognise that there is a high likelihood this planning permission would be carried out and therefore view it as a fall-back position to which significant weight needs to be attached. The appeal proposal would be similar to the permission with the exception that one of the pitched roofs would be extended forwards to form a gable above an altered front elevation.
-

5. The frontage of the appeal property is a later addition that detracts from its appearance and that of the courtyard and Burlington Lodge Studios. The proposal would create a shallow gable above part of the frontage and would include the insertion of 3 windows at ground floor level and one within the gable. Although these works are relatively minor, I am not convinced that the new frontage would adequately reflect and respond to the proportions and design of the host building, therefore resulting in harm to the architectural integrity of the Building of Townscape Merit and the courtyard.
6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character of the Conservation Area and would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host building. It is therefore contrary to Policy DM G7 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan (2013) (LP) which states that alterations and extensions to designated heritage assets will only be permitted if the significance of the heritage asset is preserved or enhanced or if there is clear and convincing justification. There is also conflict with Policy BE1 of the Core Strategy (2011) and LP Policy DM G3 which, amongst other matters, seek development that is of a high standard of design, respect local context and protects the character and appearance of the borough's conservation areas.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR