



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2025

by SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/25/3364912

161 Minard Road, Lewisham, London SE6 1NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Janet Howden against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/138667.
 - The development is described as: Erection of replacement boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit I observed that the replacement boundary walls have been erected. For the avoidance of doubt, I confirm that my determination of the appeal is based on the drawings submitted with the original application.
3. The Council has confirmed that the policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy (June 2011) and the Lewisham Development Management Plan (November 2014) referred to in the Decision Notice have been superseded by policies from the Lewisham Local Plan (July 2025) (LLP). Appeal decisions must be based on the policies from the development plan prevailing at the time of determination. The Council has suggested that Policies QD1, QD2 and QD6, which cover design issues, of the LLP are now the policies relevant to the determination of this appeal. The guidance within the Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD) is also a relevant consideration. The appellant was invited to submit representations in relation to the policies of the LLP although none were received.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling situated on a residential street, occupying a prominent corner position at the junction of Minard Road and Dowanhill Road. While boundary treatments vary among nearby properties, they predominantly consist of low brick walls, brick piers, limited height vertical railings or open-plan front gardens, contributing to the established character of the street.

6. The proposal involves a boundary treatment approximately 1.85 metres high, comprising rendered block piers topped with black ball finials, a rendered dwarf wall, and black horizontal wrought iron railings.
7. The SPD clearly discourages front boundary treatments exceeding 1m in height and places emphasis on preserving traditional details. As a result of its height and the use of horizontal railings the proposal results in a visually intrusive, enclosing and incongruous feature that is at odds with the prevailing character of Minard Road and the wider Corbett Estate, which is defined by modest boundaries and open frontages.
8. Given the position of the site at a road junction, the boundary treatment is particularly visible from public vantage points along both Minard and Dowanhill Roads. Its form and scale appear stark and overbearing in contrast to the generally modest frontages nearby.
9. While several examples of similar development have been cited by the appellant, I do not have comprehensive details of the planning context or justification for those approvals. Notably, 115 Verdant Lane, 53 Hafton Road, 80 Minard Road, 180 Minard Road and 183 Sandhurst Road are located some distance away and are not positioned on prominent corner plots. 136 Minard Road presents a markedly different front boundary treatment to the appeal proposal. Based on the evidence provided, I am not satisfied that these represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. I have therefore determined this appeal on its own merits and find that the presence of other such developments does not justify further harm at this site.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies QD1, QD2 and QD6 of the LLP, which collectively seek to ensure that development respects local context development and enhances the built environment. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD, which aims to support high-quality development that is respectful to local character, and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024)(the Framework).

Other Matters

11. The appellant sets out that the development helps to reduce the risk of crime and disorder. However, I have not been provided with convincing evidence to demonstrate that a more contextually appropriate boundary treatment could not achieve the same outcome. As such, this consideration does not outweigh the harm previously identified.
12. I acknowledge the principles of making efficient use of land, replacing outdated structures, and using high-quality materials are well established planning objectives. However, these factors do not override the importance of achieving a design that is appropriate to its setting. In this case, the identified harm significantly outweighs the limited benefits put forward by the appellant.

Conclusion

13. The proposal does not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it.
14. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR