The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2020

**by David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28th October 2020.**

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/20/3249906**
**294 King Street, London W6 0RR**

- 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 Hiwa Saleh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
- The application Ref 2019/02100/FUL, dated 10 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2019.
- The development proposed is a replacement shopfront.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement shopfront at 294 King Street, London W6 0RR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/02100/FUL, dated 10 July 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

## Procedural Matter

2. The shop front had been fitted at the time of my visit. This has no bearing on my decision which is based on the planning merits of the proposal.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development undertaken on the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the Westcroft Square Conservation Area (CA).

## Reasons

4. The appeal relates to ground floor commercial unit which is currently used as a barber shop. It sits within a larger building which contains flats on the upper floors and several other commercial units at ground floor level.

5. I understand that the original shopfront had a recessed entrance and was one of three original shopfronts within the wider building. Whilst the recesses are an attractive feature, the three shopfronts are not entirely consistent in terms of their width and overall appearance. Furthermore, at my visit, I noted the presence of a large, predominantly glazed shopfront within the building which clearly has no recess. This arrangement gives the ground floor of the building a

mixed rather than a consistent appearance which, to my mind, reduces the significance of the recess feature.

6. The 'as existing' plans indicate that the original shopfront was of an attractive design. I am mindful that Key Principle CAG4 of the Council's adopted 'Planning Guidance' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seeks to resist the removal of historic shopfronts in Conservation Areas. However, this policy does facilitate new shopfronts; directing that they must incorporate high quality designs and materials which are appropriate to the architectural character of the building.

7. The replacement shopfront has not replicated the recessed entrance of the previous shopfront as the doorway is now broadly flush fitting. Nevertheless, it is finished in an appropriate material and it is of a high quality and attractive design which exhibits traditional features and proportioning. To this end, and against the context I have described above, I am satisfied that the replacement shopfront has a neutral effect on the overall character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the CA within which it sits.

**Overall Conclusions**

8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the shopfront which has been installed preserves the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the CA. As such, I find no conflict with the overall aims of policies DC1, DC5 and DC8 of the adopted Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan and Key Principles CAG3, CAG4 and SD1 of the SPD, which collectively promote good design that respects and enhances townscape context and heritage assets.

9. Accordingly, the appeal succeeds. As the shopfront is already in place and it is visually acceptable, planning permission can be granted unconditionally.

*David Fitzsimon*

INSPECTOR