
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/Z/17/3177728

City E Net, 44 Deptford High Street, London SE8 4AF

- 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 Mrs Natalie Gaunt of New Wave Installations Cardtronics UK Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/17/100509, dated 15 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is retention of an ATM installed through the shopfront left hand window frame. Original glazing has been replaced with a new white laminate infill panel incorporating the ATM fascia. Wincor 6626 rear loader ATM fascia only with illuminated Cashzone green acrylic ATM fascia top sign with the white illuminated lettering "cashzone" and accepted card logos. The existing security roller shutter has been modified to allow constant use of the ATM.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of an ATM installed through the shopfront left hand window frame together with minor modifications to the shopfront and security screen at City E Net, 44 Deptford High Street, London SE8 4AF in accordance with the application Ref DC/17/100509 dated 15 November 2016 and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan at 1:1250 scale (dated 10 August 2016); Drawing E018936; and Drawing NW0116.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal proposal was originally subject to a single application for planning permission and consent to display advertisements dated 15 November 2016 using the description in the banner above. In determining the proposal the Local Planning Authority (LPA) split the scheme and advertisement consent for the internally illuminated ATM and associated fascia signage was granted by the LPA under a separate decision (reference DC/17/100510).
3. The decision notice for application reference DC/17/100509 refers to refusal for planning permission. In my decision I have used the description taken from this decision notice which I consider more accurately describes the appeal proposal. However, the appeal paperwork, notably from the LPA, considers the appeal on the basis of seeking advertisement consent. It has subsequently been confirmed with both parties that the appeal relates solely to the proposed development to alter the shopfront and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

4. The application was considered on a retrospective basis by the LPA. I observed the various alterations at the appeal premises have already been implemented as per the submitted plans and the appeal is determined on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations on the character and appearance of the locality, having particular regard to (1) the appearance of No.44 Deptford High Street and (2) whether or not it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Deptford High Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. No.44 Deptford High Street comprises a two storey building with a modern shopfront at ground floor level formed of a bold contemporary fascia sign beneath which a plain aluminium framework supports a central metal and glazed double doorway and two side panels above a low metal stallriser. When facing the storefront from the street the right hand panel remains fully glazed whereas the left hand panel has been adapted to accommodate the pale coloured laminate panel and ATM within the unaltered aluminium framing.
7. The Deptford High Street Conservation Area (the CA) has a vibrant commercial character including the street market. The heritage significance would appear to be its established position as a commercial thoroughfare and the various vernacular buildings peppered along it. It is also evident, however, that it is an area that has evolved with numerous adaptations to shop frontages and some modern redevelopment and infill buildings. As such the visual unity in the streetscene in the CA would appear to be relatively loose with a key connecting thread being the array of commercial uses, including modern premises.
8. The design quality of the modern shopfront at No.44 can only be best described as moderate, with little of merit in terms of its scale, materials and detailing. There are numerous examples of comparable designs and quality to shop fronts elsewhere in the CA. The visual effect resulting from the loss of the left hand glazing panel is relatively small such that I do not consider it to be harmfully disruptive to the appearance of the building or the balance of its frontage. Indeed, the sheen to the composite laminate panel has an almost diaphanous quality that from a distance it appears like film covered glazing. The solid infilling does not appear discordant with either the modern, utilitarian appearance of the shopfront or the character or appearance of the wider CA where a limited number of other similar infills can be found.
9. There are other ATMs elsewhere along the length of Deptford High Street such that they are feature of this commercial area including examples comparable to the appeal proposal. Accordingly, I do not find the proposed ATM results in visual clutter or harms the modern frontage appearance of the host building.
10. The LPA has referred to its Shopfront Design Supplementary Planning Document 2006. This does not preclude the use of modern materials and acknowledges they may be appropriate for modern shopfronts but cautions against modern materials in conservation areas. In this particular case, for the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that the use of modern materials at the appeal site does not have a negative impact on the significance of the CA.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed alterations do not have a significantly harmful effect on the character or appearance of the locality, with particular

reference to No.44 Deptford High Street or the wider Deptford High Street Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal broadly accords with London Plan¹ Policy 7.4, Lewisham Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 Policies 15 and 16 and Policies DM19, DM30 and DM36 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan 2014. These policies require, amongst other things, for proposals to be of a high quality and reflect and improve the character and quality of their surroundings and to have regard to the heritage significance of conservation areas. Accordingly, it is also consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design and conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

12. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. The LPAs appeal paperwork related to advertisements and associated conditions for express consent. As such they were invited to submit suggested conditions relevant to the appeal proposal but none were received. As the proposal is retrospective, and those elements of the overall scheme pertaining to advertisements are controlled by conditions to consent reference DC/17/100510, I am only imposing the single condition to this decision that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I consider this necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

David Spencer

Inspector.

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (March 2015)