



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 November 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/20/3248014

190-196 Deptford High Street, LONDON SE8 3PR

- 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 Sharon Properties against the decision of London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/113777, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of an additional storey comprising a roof extension at 190-196 Deptford High Street, SE8 to facilitate provision of 1 x two-bedroom flat together with the re-cladding of the existing elevations at first and second floor, and the re-cladding of the staircase structure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the sake of clarity and brevity I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Deptford High Street Conservation Area (DHSCA).

Reasons

4. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The DHSCA, within the immediate setting of the appeal site, is characterised predominantly by large properties with commercial uses at ground floor and residential to the upper floors. The properties have high level of architecture with traditional detailing and consistent built form. In my view the significance of the DHSCA is derived from the architectural character, design and styles of the buildings collectively.

6. The proposed development, due to its height, scale and design, would introduce an incongruous feature that would not be sympathetic to the surrounding area. The existing building is located on a corner plot and described as being not of any particular architectural or historic merit. The proposal would introduce high parapets with the extension not having any significant set back from the existing elevations which would appear bulky and disproportionate to the existing property.
7. Whilst the proposed windows would align with the fenestration in the existing building, the design and scale of the extension would not harmonise with the existing proportions of the appeal building. The roof form in the area is varied however, the proposal would be a dominant structure that would appear overly high and out of keeping with the existing built form of the area.
8. Planning conditions can be utilised to agree final materials for the proposal. High quality materials would not outweigh the harm created by the size, height and design of the extension which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the DHSCA.
9. The proposal would be a discordant structure that would be highly visible in the surrounding area and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the DHSCA. The proposal would be contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, Policies 30, 31 and 36 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan 2014, the Lewisham Alterations and Extension Supplementary Planning Document 2019 and the Framework which seeks development to achieve high quality architectural and urban design, and to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
10. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case, design and access statement and heritage statement including the previous applications¹ and the pre-application correspondence. These matters however do not alter my findings above.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers including exceeding the standards in the Nationally Described Space Standards document. I note that the Council have not raised any concerns with regards to effects of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties; flooding matters; cycle parking and refuse storage. These matters however would not outweigh the harm I have identified in the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference Numbers: DC/16/096550 and DC/18/106896