



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

**by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 01 March 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/20/3258631**

**14 Fairholme Road, London W14 9JX**

- 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 Stuart Marks against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council.
  - The application Ref 2020/00898/FUL, dated 1 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is a rear extension connected to existing loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part, the preservation or enhancement of its significance as a non-designated heritage asset and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barons Court Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is designated as non-designated heritage asset recognised by its local designation as a building of merit along with the highly decorative terrace of uniform properties of which it forms part, and which lie within the CA and contribute to its significance.
4. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a CA.
5. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out how planning authorities should seek the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and establishes that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning.
6. The proposal would add a single room extension on to what is a third floor open terrace, situated on top of the existing rear addition. The extension would

connect to a previous roof level extension, with a step down into the proposed new room formed by the extension. This would be accompanied by alteration at roof level to achieve the connection between the existing and proposed extensions and the addition of a roof light to provide light to the existing main living area of the dwelling.

7. Although relatively modest in size and with traditional materials used for its finishes, the proposal would not reflect the simple architectural form and expression of the rear of these properties and would, therefore, appear as a discordant addition.
8. As it would add another floor level, the proposed extension would appear as a prominent extension to the existing back addition, which currently, along with those of neighbouring and surrounding properties, appears to be substantially in its original flat roofed form, height and scale.
9. Although visible mainly from the rear of adjacent and neighbouring properties opposite, the proposed development would also be apparent in wider views. The proposal would, therefore, appear as an incongruous addition to the host property and would interrupt the coherence and commonality of the terrace of which it forms part.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to planning approvals for what appear to be other similar extensions in the area and provided me with drawings related to a planning approval for extending 32 Fairholme Road. As these would have been considered on their own merits, I have, likewise, considered the proposed development on the same basis, which is a fundamental principle that underpins the planning system and have afforded them moderate weight in my considerations.
11. I find that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property, and that of the terrace of which it forms part. I further find that the proposed development would harm the historic character and appearance of the dwelling and would not sustain or enhance the significance of the building as a non-designated historic asset, the harm to which would be less than substantial.
12. The proposal would also detract from the existing substantial retained uniformity between buildings in the terrace, which helps to define the character and appearance of the CA. The proposed development does not, therefore preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, the harm to which would be less than substantial.
13. For these reasons I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and Key Principle BM2 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which collectively seek to ensure that roof extensions are of a high standard of design, reflect the character of the existing development, respect and enhance its townscape and conserve and enhance heritage assets including conservation areas and non-designated heritage assets. For these reasons the proposal would also not accord with sections 12 and 16 of the Framework.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

14. I acknowledge the appellants view that the extension would better meet the needs of existing and future occupiers of the dwelling. However, in general, planning decisions should be made in the wider public interest. In this context, the harm I have identified, including the less than substantial harm to the CA and the non-designated heritage asset outweighs these benefits. Dismissing the appeal is a proportionate response in this instance.

*Victor Callister*

INSPECTOR