



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2025

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/25/3370874

Former Scout Hut, St Swithun's Road, Lewisham, London SE13 6RW

- 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 Milesahead Properties Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/138517.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing former scout hall/hut and provision of 9 dwellings within a three storey block (second floor in roofspace) with associated private amenity spaces, landscaping works provision of cycle spaces and bin stores at former scout hall/hut St Swithun's Road SE13.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the appeal stage, the appellant has submitted additional and updated reports including on heritage, design and access, energy efficiency, landscaping and in response to the second reason for refusal. Updated plans have also been supplied which show additions such as solar panels to the building, and changes to provide a communal garden, together with revisions to tree retention/planting.
3. The Council object to the acceptance of these reports and changes at the appeal stage. However, the reports mainly focus on providing an additional supporting case to justify the scheme rather than amendments to the scheme itself. Such submissions are presently normal practice at an appeal when further information can be supplied to seek to overcome the reasons for refusal.
4. The changes to the plans themselves are reasonably modest. For instance, the amendments to the garden areas and planting could, if found to be acceptable, be dealt with, in the normal course of events, by planning conditions in any approval. While I am conscious of the advice in the Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals - England that a scheme should not be evolved at the appeal stage, given the nature and extent of the information, I do not consider there are substantive or procedural matters that would adversely affect the interested parties or the Council. I will determine the appeal based on this latest information.
5. At the appeal stage, a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) has been submitted to seek to address the fifth reason for refusal. This concerns the policy requirement for the units to be car-free housing. The Council has confirmed that, subject to it being registered as a Land Charge, the UU addresses the fifth reason for refusal. I agree. The timing of the submission of the UU complies with the Procedural Guide

and the obligations meet with the tests in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. I give the UU full weight.

6. Since the decision to refuse the planning permission, on 16 July 2025, the Council has adopted a new local plan. The Lewisham Local Plan (July 2025) supersedes the policies of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Local Plan (November 2014) referenced in the decision notice. The Council has identified those new policies in its appeal statement which it is argued support each reason for refusal.
7. Additionally, the Council has also highlighted Policy HO3 of the Lewisham Local Plan concerning affordable housing. It is argued, in accordance with this policy, that the proposal should now make a contribution towards affordable housing and, in the absence of such a contribution, the scheme would not be policy compliant.
8. The appellant has made comments on the implications of the new Lewisham Local Plan at the final comments stage, including with regard to affordable housing. I am required to determine the appeal based on the adopted development plan at this time and I am satisfied that the appellant has had the opportunity to comment on these now adopted policies, including any affordable housing requirements.

Main Issues

9. The main issues are;
 - the effect of the development on the setting of the grade II listed St Swithun's Church and the setting of the locally listed Vicarage.
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including trees and landscaping,
 - whether or not the scheme would be acceptable in terms of energy efficiency in its construction design, and
 - whether or not the scheme should make an affordable housing contribution and, if so, whether or not this can be secured as part of the development.

Reasons

Heritage

10. Adjoining the appeal site is St Swithun's Church, a grade II listed building. Attached to the Church is the Church Hall, opened in 1884, which was originally a mission church that provided church accommodation as part of the expansion of Lewisham in the late 19th century. Shortly after the establishment of the Hall, St Swithun's Church was designed by the architect Ernest Newton and the foundations laid in July 1892, with the building completed and consecrated in 1905. Newton was a notable arts and crafts architect of that time and this is his only surviving church.
11. St Swithun's Church is a large, well-designed late Victorian and Edwardian town church which has a substantial presence amongst the more modest residential buildings in the surrounding roads. The red brick elevations, and Bath stone windows and door dressings, with slate roof, provide an attractive and imposing built form. In particular, as explained in the listing description, the most distinctive feature of the exterior is the use of large windows. These windows, with their vertical lights and tracery, are impressive features that form important aspects of

the architectural significance of the building. The heritage significance of the building therefore, includes, its historical and architectural importance amongst this part of Lewisham.

12. In terms of the setting to the Church, to the west, fronting Hither Green Lane, the Church window within this large front façade has a dominance reflective of the importance of the building to the area. This frontage is quite an urban setting to the building and can be contrasted with the southern elevation of the Church which is experienced within adjoining sections of St Swithun's Road.
13. In this location along St Swithun's Road, the Church is set back from the road and there is the rear garden of the Vicarage and most of the appeal site which is covered by a scattering of trees and undeveloped. Along this southern elevation of the Church, the south transept has a particularly tall, four-light window with a transom and Geometrical tracery in the head. This window faces onto the undeveloped space.
14. At my site visit, the leaves were off most of the trees in this undeveloped space and, therefore, there were reasonably clear views of large parts of this side of the Church, over the boundary fence, from sections of St Swithun's Road. At other times of the year this elevation of the Church may only receive glimpsed views between the trees from the nearby residential properties and from adjoining public locations. At these times there is an even more verdant aspect of the setting to the building.
15. This undeveloped space alongside parts of the southern elevation of the Church, with its mix of small and medium height trees, provides the building with a softened, reasonably open and peaceful aspect. This allows its significance and importance to be revealed and appreciated. Consequently, this undeveloped space is a valuable component to the setting of this listed building.
16. Towards the eastern end of the undeveloped space is the Scout Hut. This is a derelict building and its poor state of repair is evident over the boundary fence. The Hut is seen in some views in the foreground of the Church. However, because of its position towards the end of this space, and with its low ridge height and modest bulk, views of much of the Church over the Hut are still possible from positions on the opposite side of St Swithun's Road. In all these circumstances, the Hut has a minor adverse effect on the setting of this designated heritage asset.
17. When examining this appeal proposal and as a decision-maker, I must consider this appeal in light of the statutory duty placed upon me under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which requires that special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
18. The Scout Hut would be removed as part of the scheme and this would be a benefit in visual and historic terms, including moving built form away from the boundary with the Hall. However, a much more substantial building would be constructed on the site. This building would extend from near the corner within St Swithun's Road, up the gentle slope, and the western end of the new building would be sited partially across, albeit set forward from, the southern transept

window. The building would be 2 storeys in height, with additional accommodation in the roof and in the front gables.

19. There would still be angled views from St Swithun's Road of the feature transept window between the rear of the Vicarage and the end of the new building, albeit that this framing would change the character of this part of the setting. However, beyond that point in the road, the new development would very substantially block many of the existing views of the main parts of the Church including a great deal of the transept window from many parts of the road.
20. The effect of the development would be that the new building would impose its presence in the foreground of the Church from these eastern sections of the southern limb of St Swithun's Road. As a consequence, the new building would harmfully erode this part of the setting to the Church, including with the corresponding loss of the parts of the undeveloped and verdant space.
21. This harm resulting from the bulk and position of the building would be increased because of the unsympathetic frontage design of the building in the context of this location, including with large patio windows and balconies to the front gables, and the fairly dominant flat roofed dormers to the roof. This composition would have a visually jarring presence alongside the historic character of the Church. Furthermore, the rear elevation, which would face the Church and Hall, would appear quite functional in appearance, with overly dominant long flat roofed dormers with the probable addition of angled solar panels to their roofs, such that the appearance and bulk would not complement the nearby listed building.
22. I accept that the scheme would not affect the setting of the Church when considered from the west and north. However, the scheme would have a considerable and harmful presence when considered in relation to its setting when viewed from the southern limb of St Swithun's Road. From this location the scheme would clearly and demonstrably detract from this important part of the setting of the listed Church and would, thereby, unacceptably undermine its heritage significance. Because of the level of harm that I have found, and the importance of this listed building and the positive contribution that this undeveloped space to the side of the Church makes to its setting, this harm would be towards the upper end of the less than substantial scale within the meaning of paragraph 215 of the Framework. I will weigh this harm against the public benefits later in this decision.
23. The northern half of the Vicarage predates the Church and Hall, and is a building of interest in its own right. It appears to have origins as a Regency house and it has an attractive double storey bow window to the rear that faces down the garden. The information indicates that when the old house became a Vicarage in the 1880s, it was given a facelift to Hither Green Lane in smooth red brick and extended southwards. The composition of the extension and remodelling indicates the possible hand of Ernest Newton, the architect of the Church. The Church and Vicarage therefore have a strong visual connection in the use of red brick and historical associations. These represent important elements of its heritage significance and the Vicarage is deserving of the assessment that it should be considered a locally listed building.
24. The proposed development would be sited close to the boundary of what is now the end of the garden to the Vicarage. The end gable would be prominent in

association with the rear of the Vicarage. This end gable has been designed fairly neutrally, however, the front projecting gable with balconies would be a somewhat bulky addition to the side profile when viewed from areas around the rear of the Vicarage. Overall, I consider that the bulk and position of the end section of the proposed development would extend too far to the west, such that it would unduly intrude into the setting of the rear of the Vicarage and harm the relationship and association with the adjoining Church.

25. The result of the development would be to unacceptably undermine the setting and harm the significance of the locally listed Vicarage and I consider that this would be to the low to moderate end of the less than substantial scale. In accordance with paragraph 216 I will take this harmful effect of the proposal on the significance of this non-designated heritage asset into account as part of the overall planning balance.
26. In coming to my conclusions on this issue, I have very carefully considered the appellant's specialist heritage evidence including at the application, appeal and final comments stage. In particular, the Heritage Statement December 2024 (HCUK Group) provides a very good analysis of the history and significance of this group of buildings. Nevertheless, for the reasons explained above, I consider that the subsequent analysis of the effects of the scheme in the appellant's submissions underestimates the adverse heritage impact that would be caused by the development. Although I have undertaken my own analysis above, this chimes more with the views of the Council's Conservation Officer, to which I give greatest weight in terms of the heritage submissions.
27. To conclude, there would be some reasonably minor heritage benefits from the appeal scheme. These include the removal of the derelict Scout Hut and that the new built form would be pulled away from the boundary of the Hall allowing that building to be greater appreciated. The removal of the functional fence around the boundary would also be a visual improvement. Furthermore, with the removal of the Hut, and the position of the new building set forward in its site, there would be a gap at its rear and an improved, albeit oblique, view of the Church side elevation from a small section of the eastern part of St Swithun's Road.
28. However, these worthwhile but modest heritage benefits would be very substantially outweighed by the adverse heritage impact of the development. I conclude that the loss of a significant part of the undeveloped space, which makes a positive and valuable contribution to the setting of this grade II listed building, in association with the introduction of the fairly bulky residential building in its proposed position, would cause undue harm to this part of the setting to the Church. The scheme would adversely affect its significance as a designated heritage asset. There would also be an adverse effect on the setting of the Vicarage, and thereby detract from the significance of this locally listed building. The duty under section 66 of the Act would not be met and there would be conflict with Policies HE1, HE2, HE3 and QD10 of the Lewisham Local Plan and the Framework which, amongst other things, set out the approach to preserve or enhance the value and significance of Lewisham's historic environment.

Character and appearance

29. St Swinthur's Road is an L shaped road which is mainly formed by semi-detached houses, some now divided into flats. The houses have a two storey form and

character, with fairly intricate mouldings around the main entrance doors, double height bays also with mouldings, and often with sash windows. The roofs are hipped and this provides them with a modest bulk, although there are a few exceptions to this roof form. The buildings have a consistency of appearance and with the double height bays the road has an attractive and rhythmical character.

30. As explained above, along one side of the southern section of St Swithun's Road is the undeveloped space next to the Church. This space with its scattering of small and medium height trees provides a pleasant and green relief to the more densely built urban area of this street and the immediate surroundings. The trees may, in the main, be self-sown and many individually of minor quality, but collectively, this space behind the fence combines to provide a pleasant character to the road. The Scout Hut in the end section is derelict and visually poor but this is a reasonably low and modest structure that does not intrude greatly in the street scene. Facing the eastern section of the road is the Church Hall which also has a fairly modest height and forms part of the Church site.
31. Within some of the roads in the surrounding area there is a greater range to the design and height of dwellings, including with some three storey and others with half-dormers to second floor attic accommodation. However, this mix is not evident within St Swithun's Road where those dwellings that face the road have a consistency of design and appearance.
32. The proposed development would have three quite dominant front projecting gables with balconies and large patio windows, untypical of the more subtle bays to the adjoining houses. While these proposed gables may have a rhythmical element, when combined with the width of the development, the gable roofs rather than hipped roofs, and the reasonably large front dormers to the roof, the scheme would not be reflective, even in a contemporary way, of the distinctive and attractive features, proportions and bulk of the surrounding pairs of houses within the road. Furthermore, the end gable fronting onto the eastern section of the road would be an uncomfortable mix of solid and glazed areas, inset balconies and an overly large window to the top of the gable, such that this end of the building would harmfully jar with the character of the surroundings.
33. Parts of the rear of the building would be seen in some angled street scene views. The quite functional appearance of this rear elevation, with the overly long flat roofed dormers, with probable angled solar panels to the dormer roofs, would draw the eye and not complement the street scene.
34. Notwithstanding efforts at the appeal stage to seek to retain some of the trees, I consider that it would be likely that the site would need to be cleared to make way for the development and to ensure it would be suitable for subsequent residential occupation. This includes the attractive Turkey Oak (T1) close to the Church. If sought to be retained, this tree would cover a substantial section of some of the rear gardens and the canopy would unduly shade light to some of the rear windows. The loss of these trees and the accompanying development of the open space would be harmful to the street scene and the biodiversity of the site.
35. The subdivision of the rear area to form separate gardens, including a communal garden, would not be an especially noticeable feature given that it would be largely screened by fencing and the building. Also, the plans show a new planting scheme including with generally suitable trees. However, this positive element of the

planting scheme would not come close to compensating for the loss of the undeveloped space and the removal of the informal mix of trees on this site.

36. The new development would be of a very similar height as the adjoining pairs of dwellings in the road and much lower than the Church. However, the front gables with balconies at roof height and the front dormers would give the visual impression that the building was more than a simple two storey building. This would reinforce the case that the scheme was out of character with the surrounding residential context of St Swithun's Road.
37. Drawing these matters together, the scheme would involve the loss of an important part of the undeveloped and verdant space, with the loss of the present biodiversity. The new development, in the context of the pattern and form of the existing residential buildings, would be overly bulky and poorly designed and, as a consequence, would not integrate successfully into the locally distinctive street scene. The visual effects of the proposed landscaping and the removal of the fence and derelict Scout Hut would provide little to compensate for the level of harm to the character and appearance of the area resulting from the scheme.
38. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to meet the design expectations of the Framework that development should add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character and history. In terms of the development plan there would be conflict with Policies QD1, QD6, QD8, QD10, GR3 and GR5 of the Lewisham Local Plan which notably seek that development proposals must demonstrate an understanding of the site context and respond positively to Lewisham's local distinctiveness by providing for buildings, spaces and places that reinforce and enhance local character.

Energy efficiency

39. Policy SD2 of the Lewisham Local Plan includes the requirement that development proposals must submit a Sustainable Design Statement and that this should clearly set out how the design-led approach has been used to ensure the integration of sustainable design principles, including consideration of the construction and operation phases of development. Policy SD3 of the Lewisham Local Plan explains that to help Lewisham to become a net zero-carbon Borough, development proposals must be designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in operation and minimise energy demand (annual and peak) in accordance with the London Plan energy hierarchy.
40. At the appeal stage, more detailed information on energy and sustainability has been submitted and which seeks to show the scheme could comply with the requirements of the development plan. This includes providing high levels of insulation, triple glazed windows and highlighting the generous glazing areas to allow daylight and passive heating. However, there is some uncertainty with other aspects of the scheme as the information indicates that space heating and hot water would be provided by air source heat pumps or direct electricity. It is not clear how direct electricity, if that were the chosen option for the 9 flats, would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. If the air source heat pumps were to be pursued, the details do not clearly show how or where the units could be accommodated on the site within the proposed garden layout without adversely affecting amenity or access to those areas for some residents.

41. Also, the updated information explains that a high efficiency solar panel system will be designed to be located on the roofs of the rear dormers located on the rear elevation of the terrace. These panels would be angled to face south. Notwithstanding that this would have a visual impact, there is little evidence to show that there would be adequate space on the dormer roofs for solar panels to provide a meaningful contribution to meet the energy needs of the 9 flats in the development.
42. It seems to me that the scheme has not been design-led from the outset with renewable energy and sustainability at the forefront. The submissions at the appeal stage appear to seek to retrofit some measures into the scheme which would have been better considered comprehensively at the original design stage. The evidence does not encourage me to believe that the scheme would be as effective as it should or could be in respect of minimising greenhouse emissions and sustainability. I do not consider that it would be reasonable to seek to address these matters by a condition in any approval given the uncertainty as to some of the approaches and that elements would likely be more effective if embedded into an original design of a new development.
43. Consequently, I conclude that I am not satisfied that the scheme would meet the Framework requirement that all development should be planned for in ways that help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design. As it would not be acceptable in terms of its energy efficiency in its construction design, I also find there would be conflict with Policies SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the Lewisham Local Plan which seek, amongst other things, to minimise greenhouse gas emissions.

Affordable housing

44. The scheme would provide 9 units of residential accommodation. In this respect the proposal would fall into the minor category of development, rather than a major scheme which would have 10 or more units. The Framework explains that provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments¹.
45. However, the recently adopted Policy HO3 of the Lewisham Local Plan includes Part J which is titled small sites (minor developments). This part of the policy states that development proposals for new housing delivering between 2 and 9 dwelling units must make provision for affordable housing.
46. In explaining the need for affordable housing, the Lewisham Local Plan notes that there are acute issues of overcrowding and homelessness in the borough, that as of May 2019 there were approximately 10,000 households on the housing waiting list, that the gap between incomes and housing costs is rapidly widening and, as a consequence, there is a significant local need for affordable housing.
47. Policy HO3 of the Lewisham Local Plan would have been considered as part of the Local Plan Inspectors' scrutiny/report, and has been adopted, in the knowledge of the affordable housing policy in the Framework regarding minor development sites. Furthermore, the supporting text to the Policy HO3 explains that the Local Plan

¹ The site is not in a designated rural area and therefore the Framework allowance for policies to set a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer does not apply.

Viability Assessment (2022) has demonstrated that this requirement will not adversely impact on the development viability of small sites across the Borough.

48. The affordable housing requirement appears, therefore, to have been justified based on local affordable housing circumstances and need, and the requirement now forms part of a recently adopted development plan. Notwithstanding the policy position of the Framework, I attach full weight to Policy HO3 of the Lewisham Local Plan. A policy compliant level of affordable housing is, therefore, required to make the appeal scheme acceptable, notwithstanding that this did not form a reason for refusal.
49. The decision to refuse the application was made by the Council before the Lewisham Local Plan was adopted. However, I am required to determine the scheme based on the latest development plan policies, and other planning considerations, and the information before me.
50. There is no legal mechanism as part of the appeal in the form, for instance, of a planning agreement to provide affordable housing. The appellant has suggested at the final comments stage that, if I was to find such an affordable housing contribution necessary, I could secure this through a planning condition. It is advised this could be in the form of an 'Affordable Housing Strategy' pre-commencement condition and which would be triggered prior to any works taking place on site. However, this would leave the level of affordable housing provision uncertain and open to future discussion, perhaps through viability evidence, and I consider that this is a material issue that should be determined as part of this assessment of the proposal.
51. Furthermore, the condition would very likely lead to some form of obligation to ensure either a financial payment or the provision of a certain number of affordable units on site with the related occupancy restrictions. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that a negatively worded condition limiting the development that can take place until a planning obligation or other agreement has been entered into is unlikely to be appropriate in the majority of cases. One of the reasons cited for agreeing an obligation in a timely manner is in the interests of transparency.
52. The suggested condition would leave the outcome as to how many units of affordable housing or the financial sum that may be paid uncertain. This would not provide sufficient transparency at this stage of the planning process. I consider that there are no exceptional circumstances, in terms of the approach set out in the Guidance, for a planning condition that would, in all probability, lead to an obligation. Consequently, I consider that such a condition would not be reasonable and would not provide sufficient precision as to the affordable housing outcome.
53. In conclusion, on the basis that a condition, either as suggested by the appellant or in any other form, would not be appropriate, and in the absence of a completed planning agreement, affordable housing would not be secured to meet with the terms of Policy HO3 of the Lewisham Local Plan. The scheme would, therefore, not be policy compliant in this respect.

Other Matters

54. There have been objections to the development as well as representations in support. Those objections cover a wide range of issues including the design of the scheme, its impact on the listed building, extent of tree removal and that the

scheme would be out of character with the area. I have examined these matters above. Other concerns raised include the loss of privacy, overbearing impact and loss of light. All the other concerns are noted but did not form reasons for refusal and I have found no reason to disagree with the Council on these matters.

55. The comments in favour include the provision of much needed housing which would make good use of an unused piece of land, that the scheme would not impact the Church and that it will be better than the existing building. The benefits of the housing are considered below and I have examined the other matters under the main issues.

Heritage Balance

56. The scheme would cause an undue and adverse harm to part of the setting of the grade II listed Church when experienced from sections of St Swithun's Road. This is because the presently adjoining undeveloped and verdant area is an important part of the setting to the Church and the scheme would severely compromise this space with a harmful development. It would detract from the significance of this designated heritage asset. I have found that the harm would be towards the upper end of the less than substantial scale within the meaning of paragraph 215 of the Framework. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits.
57. The scheme would deliver 9 units of car-free housing within the built-up area of Lewisham. This would provide a worthwhile boost to housing supply, with an appropriate housing mix, in accordance with Framework priorities. Occupants would have good access to services and facilities by a range of sustainable means such as walking, cycling and public transport. Some reasonable levels of sustainability and energy efficiency could be accommodated as part of the scheme, although it has not been demonstrated to an appropriate and policy compliant extent. There would be economic and social benefits during construction and in subsequent occupation. Off-site habitat creation or habitat units could be purchased as part of the scheme to ensure a biodiversity net gain. There would be the benefits resulting from the payment of CIL.
58. The area would benefit from the removal of the derelict Scout Hut and therefore the scheme would use previously developed land and make efficient use of the site. However, this latter benefit is tempered as the Framework requires that decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land taking into account, amongst other things, the desirability of an area's prevailing character and setting, and also the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. These Framework requirements for the efficient use of land would not be met in this case.
59. Overall, and having regard to the Council's housing delivery and supply situation, and that only 9 units would be delivered, I attribute the collective benefits low to moderate weight in favour of approval.
60. The Framework advises that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of potential harm. I have found that the public benefits of the proposal afford low to moderate weight and therefore would not outweigh the level of harm to the significance of the listed building which, in accordance with the Framework, is required to be attributed great weight. The public benefits of the development would very clearly not

outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Planning Balance

61. The scheme would adversely affect the significance of the grade II listed Church, would harm the significance of the Vicarage, a locally listed building, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, would not make suitable provision for energy efficiency in its construction design and would not provide the required contribution for affordable housing. Each separate matter is a concerning planning issue. However, in combination these harms and related policy conflicts are a very serious failing of the development and collectively should be attributed very substantial weight against the proposal. It is such that the scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
62. The Council has failed the Housing Delivery Test, with housing completions in the past at a level well below the target. It should, however, now have a Framework compliant supply of housing land following the adoption of the Lewisham Local Plan. In any case, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in paragraph 11d of the Framework, is not engaged because the adverse impacts to the significance of the listed Church, a designated heritage asset, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. Consequently, the scheme should be determined under a normal planning balance.
63. The benefits of the scheme have been considered above, and even taking into account the poor housing delivery situation, should be attributed low to moderate weight in favour of approval. The benefits would not outweigh the harms and related policy conflicts which should be attributed very substantial weight against the proposal.

Conclusion

64. The scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no other material considerations to indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR