
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/K5600/Y/25/3369883

Ground floor, 246 Fulham Road, London SW10 9NA

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Natalie Edwards (Technical Signs) against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is LB/24/07630.
 - The works proposed are the installation of replacement signage comprising of 1 set of halo illuminated fascia text and 2 internally illuminated menus.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/K5600/Z/25/3364049

Ground floor, 246 Fulham Road, London SW10 9NA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Natalie Edwards (Technical Signs) against the decision of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
 - The application Ref is CA/24/07585.
 - The advertisement proposed is 1 set of halo illuminated fascia text and 2 internally illuminated menus.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: the appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address listed building consent and advertisement consent appeals for the same site. Whilst the remit of each regime is different, to reduce repetition and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with the two appeals together within a single decision letter whilst having regard to the statutory duty that apply under Sections 16(2) of the Act wherever applicable to do so.
4. The Regulations, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) all make it clear that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety.
5. The Council have set out that they have no objections to the scheme in relation to public safety and from what I have observed, I have no reason to disagree. I have therefore had regard to the policy references in the decision notice only in so far as they relate to amenity.

6. The Council have also clarified that the refusal reasons relate to the proposed halo illuminated fascia text only. The 2 internally illuminated menus are exact replacements of the existing menus, as shown on the existing plans, as I observed in situ, and has been previously granted consent¹. The Council has therefore no issue with these elements of the scheme, and from what has been submitted and from what I have observed, I have no reason to disagree.
7. The Council has also clarified that Policy T4 referred to in the refusal reason for Appeal B should read Policy TR4. I have therefore referred to it as such.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building and any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses, in addition to the amenity of the street scene and nearby The Boltons Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

9. 246 Fulham Road is a Grade II listed three storey (with basement) property with a commercial ground floor, currently occupied by Rosas Thai restaurant, and residential above. The building was listed in 1996, and the listing description² indicates that the building was built in 1801-2 and was formally one of a pair of houses, the left-hand of which was demolished in approximately 1989. The building is faced in stock brick with gauged window arches and has an historic hipped slate roof. The front windows and shop front were originally inserted in approximately 1878 for a firm of undertakers, however since the listing, a new shop front has been installed, and extensive remodelling of the interior has taken place. The existing shopfront is a traditional timber design with 3 large timber framed front sash windows with a stallriser and pilaster and incorporates an awning. I observed that the interior has the appearance of a modern open plan commercial premises, with little remaining historic detail.
10. Having regard to the above, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be mainly derived from its architectural and historic interests in exemplifying a good example of elegant domestic Georgian architecture that has evolved over time. Important contributors in these regards are its surviving original vernacular architectural style and use of traditional methods of construction and materials, and legible phased commercial evolution.
11. Pertinent to the appeal, numerous signage has been approved and installed on the premises over a long period of time, most recently the installation of an illuminated fascia sign and hanging board on the front elevation³. This existing fascia signage is externally illuminated through trough lighting and appears as a modest and subtle advertisement that allows the traditional form and materials of the frontage to be appreciated, ensuring it is not detracted from or overwhelmed by an unduly modern form of lighting. As such, it is generally sensitive to the historic aesthetics of the building frontage. In this respect, the existing signage has a neutral effect on the architectural integrity of the property and therefore its special interest and significance.

¹ Application reference LB/24/05989 & CA/24/05981

² List Entry Number: 1244101

³ Application reference CA/13/07505

12. The proposal seeks to repaint the fascia the same light grey colour as existing. The proposed built-up letters would have 1.2mm brushed stainless steel faces and returns which are finished with brass lacquer. 10mm opal 030 acrylic backs would be screw fixed to the timber fascia on spacers which would be finished to match the fascia. The letters would be illuminated through low energy warm white halo LEDS.
13. Whilst the appellant sets out that the proposed halo illumination would omit less light than the existing trough light, it would appear as a starkly contemporary lighting scheme and advertisement. Given its prominent siting on the frontage, it would draw the eye and appear incongruous in the context of the retained historic building frontage, traditional shop front design and use of traditional materials. It would detract from the architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
14. Fulham Road is a vibrant and lengthy road of commercial and other uses, such as the substantial Kensington and Chelsea hospital directly opposite the appeals site. A large variety of signage is evident, both internally and externally illuminated. There is therefore little consistency in this respect.
15. In the context of the surrounding variety of signage, including in terms of illumination, the proposed signs would not appear out character with the wider street scene.
16. The appeals site also sits outside but close by to the Boltons CA. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the CA are mainly derived from its high quality and uniform predominantly Victorian residential architectural style. The wider varied urban setting, including the mixed character of Fulham Road near the appeals site, therefore contributes little to its significance.
17. The proposal would also therefore sit comfortably in the mixed context surrounding the CA. In this respect therefore, the setting of this designated heritage asset would be preserved, and its significance would not be harmed.
18. Nevertheless, I conclude that proposed works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building 246 Fulham Road and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
19. Given the existing illuminated signage in the same position, I find the harm to the heritage asset to be at a minor level of 'less than substantial' but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
20. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the business and the building work. No substantive evidence has been provided which confirms that the viability of the business and the continued use of this part of the listed building would be jeopardised or would cease if the appeal were to fail and the proposal was not implemented.
21. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal, is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.

22. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in section 16(2) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework.
23. I have taken into account Policies CD1, CD2, and CD5 of the New Local Plan review (2024) (LP) which seek to protect amenity and preserve the significance of listed buildings, and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
24. I have not found conflict with LP Policy CD4 nor TR4 which are referenced in the reasons for refusal, as they refer to development affecting Conservation Areas and advertisement clutter respectively.

Conclusion

25. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR