
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2017

by S Jones MA (Oxon) DipLP

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

Decision date: 20 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/17/3167385
69A Streatham Hill, London SW2 4TX

- 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 Patraszewski and Blue Tit against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/05604/FUL dated 2 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is replacement of shopfront, removal of metal security shutter and existing signage to reveal existing decorative hidden arch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement of shopfront, removal of metal security shutter and existing signage to reveal existing decorative hidden arch at 69A Streatham Hill, London SW2 4TX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/05604/FUL, dated 2 November 2016, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Leigham Court Estate Conservation Area (CA) and the host building.

Reasons

3. I have a statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to consider whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA.
 4. The Leigham Court Estate CA comprises an early model 19th Century development of about 1000 homes plus shops and facilities laid out in an alphabetical formal grid in a variety of decorative styles. On Streatham Hill there are tall parades of 4 storey shops with decorative detailing. The property is a hairdressing salon in one of those parades of shops, and so contributes to the significance of the CA, including by its decorative detailing and original design features.
 5. Timber frames and a metal security shutter have been replaced with blue metal frames, and existing signage has been removed. The development was in place when I visited, so that this is effectively a retrospective application.
-

6. Under Policy Q16 Shopfronts of the 2015 Lambeth Local Plan (LP) timber frames are normally required for shopfronts associated with heritage assets. However, whilst this window frame is metal, the shopfront does otherwise accord with other elements of this policy and Policies Q11 and Q22 of the LP as it responds positively to the building and its surroundings. This is because it looks smart and modern, allowing a large open shop window. It has also removed some of the frontage clutter from the metal shutter fittings and the previous signage. A decorative arch which is an original feature of architectural detailing in the building can be better appreciated. It also better echoes the adjacent arched entrance to the flats above. It does not contrast unfavourably with other commercial premises along Streatham Hill.
7. These particular changes do not detract from the contribution that the premises continues to make to the significance of the CA, or affect the overall architectural integrity of the building to an unacceptable extent. Therefore I conclude that this development does not have a materially harmful effect on the significance of the CA or fail to preserve or enhance its character and appearance. Moreover, it accords with the development plan as a whole and I consider the above benefits to be the material considerations which mean that planning permission should be granted despite any conflicts with Policy Q16 and Q22 of the LP in this instance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR