



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Z/25/3367997

25 The High Parade, Streatham High Road, Lambeth, London SW16 1EX

- 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 Mr Okkes Toprak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/00539/FUL.
 - The development proposed is installation of open shopfront with roller shutters and 2 retractable awnings (Retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development has been altered in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description of development from the appeal form, as it reflects the proposal accurately and concisely. As the development has already been carried out, the appeal proposal is for the retention of the open shopfront with roller shutters and retractable awnings. This appeal is not concerned with the two signs, which have been granted advertisement consent¹ separately and do not form part of this appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The Streatham High Road and Streatham Hill Conservation Area (SHRSHCA) is characterised by the impressive length of commercial and purpose built residential apartment blocks dating from the late Victorian, Edwardian and inter-war eras. The rapid development of this area reflects the enormous social, economic and

¹ Planning application reference 25/00540

architectural changes that took place in less than a century, making Streatham a highly desirable address.

6. The appeal site is located within an inter-war shopping parade known as The High, which is the largest of the Streatham inter-war developments and characterised by its monumental design, having historically been advertised as a show place of luxury. The residential blocks fronting High Road are set back from the highway behind a continuous frontage of ground floor shops. The commercial frontage is emphasised by the integral cantilevered canopy running the length of The High, which provides shelter to pedestrians and reinforces the formal rhythm of the parade. These elements together form a coherent architectural composition that contributes positively to the significance of the SHRSHCA.
7. Whilst little information has been provided by the Council to illustrate the architectural and/or historic interest of the previous shopfront, the available evidence clearly shows that it was traditional in appearance, and fitted appropriately within the SHRSHCA. The appeal scheme has resulted in the loss of this traditional shopfront and the creation of an open frontage, save for the three pilasters which frame two entrances into the commercial unit. The lack of built elements between the commercial unit and footway results in an open void that interrupts and detracts from the visual coherence of the parade and the architectural integrity of the host building, causing unacceptable harm to the SHRSHCA.
8. The roller shutters present a blank and fortified appearance to the street and unduly stand out as a visually intrusive feature, disrupting the permeability of the parade and undermining the vitality of the shopping area. Additionally, there is no detailed evidence before me to demonstrate whether other options of a more open and sympathetic roller shutter design have been explored, which would provide similar security benefits. It is therefore my view that the roller shutters in place are incongruous, harm the streetscape and are detrimental to the character and appearance of the SHRSHCA as a whole.
9. The retractable awnings are substantial in length and visually dominant. Their positioning below the existing canopy limits their utility and exaggerates their impact on views of adjoining units, particularly when approached from the north. Furthermore, their relationship to the retained structure appears discordant. The retractable awnings therefore appear inconsistent with the building, parade and wider public realm as well as the character and appearance of the SHRSHCA.
10. The placement of products upon the adjoining footway creates visual clutter within the public realm. Although the appellant asserts that such displays are modest and characteristic of urban centres, the cumulative impact of this arrangement, in conjunction with the shutters and awnings, compromises the ability to appreciate the sweeping nature of the parade and the contribution it makes to the significance of the SHRSHCA.
11. The appellant has referenced nearby examples of similar treatments and to the architectural value of the previous shopfront. Although there is evidence of solid roller shutters within the parade, I do not have the full details of these particular developments and cannot therefore be certain that they represent a direct parallel to or provide justification for the appeal scheme. Despite being present in the wider

area, awnings are not typical within the parade. I have therefore ascribed very limited weight to these considerations.

12. Consequently, the appeal scheme fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the SHRSHCA as a whole. The proposal therefore conflicts with the design aims of Policies ED7, Q2, Q5, Q6 and Q16 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 [Adopted September 2021] (LP), which notably require historic shop fronts to be retained, and ensure that development proposals integrate with and add to the physical attractiveness of the area and are not designed with solid or perforated roller shutters. The proposal also conflicts with LP Policy Q22, which seeks to ensure that development proposals respect and reinforce the established, positive characteristics of the conservation area.

Heritage balance

13. The development fails to preserve the significance of the SHRSHCA, to which I ascribe considerable importance and weight. The appeal scheme causes less than substantial harm to the significance of the SHRSHCA, towards the lower end of that scale. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the development including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
14. It is argued that the appeal scheme increases local expenditure which supports local services and protects jobs. The scheme also protects goods from inclement weather conditions and improves security. The appellant also claims that the appeal scheme provides an improved retail experience for customers that increases revenue and also maintains the vitality of the community. However, I have been presented with no substantive evidence to demonstrate that these benefits could not be achieved in a way that does not cause considerable harm to the SHRSHCA. For these reasons, these considerations are afforded limited weight. Overall, there are no presented public benefits which would outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR