

| | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Committee | PLANNING COMMITTEE A | |
| Report Title | 16 MANOR AVENUE, LONDON, SE4 1PD | |
| Ward | BROCKLEY | |
| Contributors | Karl Fetterplace | |
| Class | PART 1 | 27 AUGUST 2015 |

Reg. Nos. DC/15/90895

Application dated 09.02.2015

Applicant Mrs M Mason

Proposal The construction of a glazed roof extension in the rear roof slope at 16 Manor Avenue SE4, together with the installation of 2 roof lights in the front roof slope.

Applicant's Plan Nos. 7468_00; 7468_01; 7468_02; 7468_03; 7468_04; 7468_05; 7468_06; 7468_09; 7468_11 and the Design & Access Statement (February 2015, JAK) received 11th February 2015; Heritage Statement (March 2015, JAK) received 24th March 2015; 7468_15; 7468_16 received 27th June 2015; Light Spillage Calculations 1 & 2 received 23rd July 2015; 7468_08; 7468_10 received 10th August 2015; 7468_07; 7468_12; 7468_13 (Proposed 3D Visualisation); 7468_13 (Proposed Sightline Analysis) received 11th August 2015.

Background Papers

- (1) Case File DE/105/16/TP
- (2) Core Strategy (2011)
- (3) Development Management Local Plan (2014)
- (4) The London Plan (2015, as amended)

Designation PTAL 4
Brockley Article 4 Direction
Brockley Conservation Area
Not a Listed Building
Unclassified

Screening N/A

1.0 Property/Site Description

1.1 The site is located on the west side of Manor Avenue in a primarily residential area and is occupied by a large four storey mid terraced Victorian Villa with lower ground floor and raised main entrance at ground floor level. The short terrace consists of four properties (Numbers 14 to 20), constructed in yellow London stock brick, with pitched slate roofs, with a central leaded flat area, and the end properties having a side hip. Each end terrace has an additional two storey side

projection and a rear ground floor bay window. The two central properties (one of which is the subject site) remain flush at the rear. The properties sit in generous plots with sizable rear gardens. A small rear ground floor addition currently exists at 2.4m depth on the boundary with No18. The property has white timber framed sash windows.

- 1.2 The building is not listed, but the site is located within the Brockley Conservation Area and is subject to the Brockley Conservation Area Article 4(2) Direction.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 PRE/13/01590: Construction of a loft conversion - verbal advice was given by officers detailing that any dormer should be subservient in the roofscape and set in from boundaries and that minimal impact should also be achieved through materials.

- 2.2 DC/13/84038 - The construction of an extension to the rear roof slope of 16 Manor Avenue SE4, together with the installation of two rooflights in the front roof slope. This was refused on 23rd September 2013 for the following reasons:

The proposed roof extension and alterations would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building and the integrity of the adjacent terraced buildings within the Brockley Conservation Area as well as having a serious and adverse effect on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties in this location, reason of its unsympathetic design and materials, excessive depth and width, prominent setting, mass and scale. As such, the development is contrary to Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham', Policy 16 'Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment' of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), Policies URB 3 Urban Design, URB 6 Alterations and Extensions, URB 16 New Development, Changes of Use and Alterations to Buildings in Conservation Areas, HSG 4 Residential Amenity and HSG 12 Residential Extensions in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

The proposed roof extension balcony area by reason of its raised siting and proximity to neighbouring buildings and property boundaries would have a serious and adverse effect on the privacy and amenity enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties in this location contrary to Policy 15 'High quality design for Lewisham', Policy 16 'Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment' of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), policies URB 3 Urban Design, URB 6 Alterations and Extensions, HSG 4 Residential Amenity, HSG 12 Residential Extensions in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2004) and the Residential Development Standards SPD (adopted August 2006 amended May 2012).

- 2.3 APP/C5690/D/13/2207370: Application DC/13/84038 was dismissed at appeal on the grounds that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Brockley Conservation Area, would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building, and the proposal would have a harmful effect on neighbours' living conditions with regard to privacy.

- 2.4 DC/13/84039 - Conservation Area Consent Application: the proposed works include a loft conversion with two conservation flat profile rooflights to the front roof slope and a dormer extension to the rear roof slope. This application was withdrawn as a Conservation Area Consent was not required.

2.5 PRE/14/01916: Construction of a loft conversion - this was not reviewed by officers as the householder pre-application service was suspended.

3.0 Current Planning Application

The Proposal

3.1 This application is for the construction of a glazed roof extension in the rear roof slope at 16 Manor Avenue SE4, together with the installation of 2 roof lights in the front roof slope. This would allow for conversion of the existing loft space into a new bedroom and shower room.

3.2 The proposed roof extension would be 3.64m wide. The setback to the eaves from the application as lodged has been increased from 0.85m to 1m at the request of officers and would be 1.075m from the party wall on either side. The roof extension would extend out at the same height as the ridgeline.

3.3 The roof is currently constructed of slate tiles. The proposed extension would be constructed of double glazed high reflective light-weight glass. The application as originally lodged did not provide further details on the type of glass, however, this has since been provided. Specifically, the panels facing the rear garden would be thermally broken powder-coated aluminium 'frameless' openable windows with high reflective 'mirror' argon filled double-glazed units. The glass on the sides of the roof extension would be thermally broken powder-coated aluminium 'frameless' fixed windows with high reflective 'mirror' argon filled double-glazed opaque units.

3.4 The glass on the roof of the dormer would be thermally broken powder-coated aluminium 'frameless' roof light panels with high reflective 'mirror' argon filled double-glazed opaque units. Integrated PVC jalousie is proposed between the glazing. Rubber joint seals 20mm in width are proposed between the panels. The dormer perimeter would have powder coated aluminium flushing around the dormer perimeter. Light spillage has been calculated by a specialist and the glazing is proposed to reduce the spillage according to these calculations.

3.5 The two rooflights to the front roofslope would be low profile conservation style and would not project from the roofslope.

3.6 The previous proposal (DC/13/84038) that was refused and went to appeal also proposed two low profile conservation rooflights to the front roof slope. However, a balcony and lantern, the latter of which projected above the ridgeline, were also included in that proposal. These have been removed from the current proposal. The extension was previously approximately 1m wider than the present application at 4.6m and the walls were proposed to be clad in slate tiles to match the existing roof. The flank walls stepped in by only 0.35m at either side, as opposed to the 1.075m currently proposed.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

4.2 A site notice and conservation area notice were displayed, letters were sent to residents in the surrounding area and the application was advertised in the local

newspaper for a period of three weeks. Local ward Councillors were consulted. No comments were received.

- 4.3 No comment was made by the Amenity Societies Panel.

Brockley Society

- 4.4 Firstly we would oppose the installation of the roof lights in the front slope in a conservation area. We would disagree that they are not seen and believe they would have a negative impact on the property and the conservation area.
- 4.5 The glazed roof extension is totally unacceptable. It is unneighbourly and would create light pollution. The fully glazed roof extension is too large and is totally unsympathetic to the character of the existing building.
- 4.6 The material is not compatible and constitutes poor design and an ill conceived proposal. The massing of the proposed extension looks completely out of scale and could create a dangerous precedent.

5.0 Policy Context

Introduction

- 5.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
 - (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
 - (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- 5.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14 a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary this states that (paragraph 211), policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan.

As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that ‘...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)’.

- 5.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

Other National Guidance

On 6 March 2014, DCLG launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) resource. This replaced a number of planning practice guidance documents.

London Plan (March 2015)

- 5.5 On 10 March 2015 the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) was adopted. The policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

Core Strategy

- 5.6 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency
Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham
Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Development Management Plan

- 5.7 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following policies are relevant to this application:-

DM Policy 1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character
DM Policy 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings
DM Policy 36 New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

5.8 Paragraph 6.3 (Materials) states that bricks and roofing material used to construct an extension should match those in the original building.

5.9 Paragraph 6.7 (Roof Extensions) states that when considering applications for extensions the Council will look at these main issues:

- All roof alterations should be successfully integrated with and preserve the architectural character of the building, and be subordinate to the principal elevations.
- Planning permission is always required for roof additions in Conservation Areas.
- The type and style of windows used should be similar to those used in the main elevations and reflect their alignment.
- For Victorian and Edwardian buildings, particularly in Conservation Areas box dormers occupying a whole roof slope are unlikely to be permitted.
- Roof extensions, including dormer windows, to the front and side elevations will be resisted in favour of roof lights set into the roof slope.
- Larger roof extensions should be located on the rear elevations in order to protect the front and side elevations from substantial alteration.
- Rear roof extensions should be set back a minimum of one metre behind the lines of eaves and a minimum of 500mm from the gable, flank or party wall boundary.
- Roof extensions will not be permitted where any part of the extension will be above the height of the ridge of the main roof.
- Roof extensions should be set back into the roof slope and not be formed by building up external walls.
- The materials used for roof extensions and dormers should be compatible with the existing roof material in order to be unobtrusive and blend into the roof slope. Preferred materials are natural or simulated slates, clay tiles, zinc, lead or copper as appropriate with fascia boards in painted timber or hardwood.
- In Conservation Areas appropriate materials should be used which preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Consideration should be given to reinstating the original type of roof covering wherever possible.
- Roof extensions to Listed Buildings will be considered each on their merits, but are unlikely to be approved if they harm historic roof structures and the overall special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
- Roof lights should be fitted flush with the slate or tiles of the roof and their number on front roof slopes should be kept to the minimum necessary in order to avoid clutter.

6.0 Planning Considerations

6.1 The relevant planning considerations are the impact on the design and appearance of the existing building and conservation area and whether the amenity of neighbouring properties is affected.

Design & Appearance

6.2 Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that 'in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the

standard of design more generally in the area'. Paragraph 131 states that 'in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development making positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

- 6.3 Core Strategy Policy 8 states that the Council supports and encourages the retrofitting of energy saving and other sustainable design measures in existing housing and other development.
- 6.4 Core Strategy Policy 15 states that the Council will apply national and regional policy and guidance to ensure highest quality design and the protection or enhancement of the historic and natural environment, which is sustainable, accessible to all, optimises the potential of sites and is sensitive to the local context and responds to local character.
- 6.5 Core Strategy Policy 16 states that the Council will ensure that the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets and their settings, conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, registered historic parks and gardens and other non designated assets such as locally listed buildings, will continue to be monitored, reviewed, enhanced and conserved according to the requirements of government planning policy guidance, the London Plan policies, local policy and English Heritage best practice.
- 6.6 DM Policy 30 states that the Council will require all development proposals to attain a high standard of design, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings. The retention and refurbishment of existing buildings that make a positive contribution to the environment will be encouraged and should influence the character of new development and a sense of place.
- 6.7 DM Policy 31 states that the Council will expect alterations and extensions to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality and respect and/or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used, appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.
- 6.8 DM Policy 36 New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens states that the Council, having paid special attention to the special interest of its Conservation Areas, and the desirability of preserving and or enhancing their character and or appearance, will not grant planning permission where alterations and extensions to existing buildings is incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.

Proposed extension to the rear roofslope

- 6.9 Officers and the Planning Inspectorate considered that the previous design was unacceptable, on the basis that the bulk and materials were unsympathetic to the host property and the wider conservation area and extension would upset the roofscape of the property and the wider conservation area. In this previous proposal, the walls were proposed to be clad in slate tiles to match the existing roof and there was proposed to be a zinc-clad roof lantern with a glazed roof light to increase headroom. The lantern was proposed to exceed the height of the ridge

and was considered an incongruous feature at roof level in buildings of this period and also specifically within this conservation area. The extension was proposed to be recessed in the centre to provide a balcony about 1.5m wide by 0.99m deep contained behind a low, slate-clad wall. The proposed balcony was also considered unacceptable by officers. As previously noted in this report, the lantern and balcony elements have been removed since the previous proposal, the latter of which projected above the ridgeline. The balcony element also presented an opportunity for noise disturbance and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties. Two low profile rooflights were proposed to be inserted into the front roofslope. The size of the extension has been reduced and it now complies numerically with the Residential SPD, as discussed below.

- 6.10 Given the changes that have been made since the previous application and also within this application from the form in which it was originally lodged, officers now consider that this proposal is acceptable. The bulk of the scheme has been reduced. The setback to the eaves has been increased from 0.85m to 1m, which is compliant with the Residential SPD. This setback was only 0.3m in the previous application. The roof extension would be setback 1.075m from the party wall on either side, which exceeds the minimum of 0.5m in the Residential SPD. This setback was only 0.375m in the previous proposal. The extension was previously approximately 1m wider at 4.6m. On the whole, the present design represents an improvement to the previous scheme and is considered acceptable by planning and urban design officers, despite concerns raised by the conservation officer and the Brockley Society.
- 6.11 It is acknowledged that the type and style of windows proposed would not be similar in design or style to that of the existing building and that concerns have been raised by the conservation officer in this regard. However, the use of glass is considered to be an appropriate use of a modern material that would not offend the existing materials of the building and would represent a high quality design. This is also the view of Council's urban design officer, who has recommended that further details be sought regarding the joining of the extension to the rear roofslope at the ridgeline, to ensure that no part of the extension projects above the height of the ridge of the main roof. This design is considered acceptable, subject to delivery in accordance with the plans. Officers have queried the functionality of the proposed and the agent has confirmed that the scheme is deliverable. The suitability of the design relies on it being lightweight in appearance. If the proposed extension were to be clad in slate with sash windows, it would not necessarily be acceptable. However, given that the proposed design is lightweight, the size is appropriate. Notwithstanding the fact that the plans don't show any pipes, a condition has been included to remove permitted development rights. This is to ensure that the scheme is delivered as designed, with no additional elements accompanying the lightweight glazing.
- 6.12 Light spillage has been calculated by a specialist and according to these calculations, the glazing is proposed to reduce the spillage. The obscure glazing proposed on the sides of the roof extension would provide privacy to the users of this space.
- 6.13 There are several rear dormers along Manor Avenue in the vicinity of the site. Additionally, the extension to the rear roofslope would not be visible from the public realm, although it is acknowledged that this alone is not sufficient reason to grant planning permission. However, although the rear roofslope extension would

introduce a feature that would affect the uniformity of the roofscape of the surrounding buildings at the rear, however given the high quality detail and design material it is not considered that this roof extension would have an adverse impact on the Brockley conservation area if it is delivered to the high standard that is demonstrated in the plans.

Proposed rooflights to the front roofslope

- 6.14 In the officer's assessment of the previous application, the conservation style roof lights on the front roof slope were not considered to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the streetscene or character and appearance of the conservation area, as their size would be relatively minor and they would not project above the roof plane. The report also stated that given their elevated position at four storeys above general eye level observation, this minor alteration within the scheme was considered acceptable on its own.
- 6.15 The Inspector acknowledged that Council officers had not raised concerns about the proposed front roof lights, although did note that the character appraisal states that 'roof-lights add visual clutter to plain roof slopes which were not historically pierced with openings. They introduce unsympathetic modern materials'. Having said this, the Inspector stated that the roof-lights are integral to the proposed scheme as a whole and it would not be appropriate to grant permission for them separately in a split decision, therefore indicating that the rooflights were acceptable.
- 6.16 Whilst acknowledging that the front roof slopes along this section of Manor Avenue are relatively pristine, there are some rooflights present in the surrounding area. The comments from the previous application that the rooflights are acceptable are agreed with and as the rooflights would not project above the roof slope, it is not considered that the proposed rooflights to the front roof slope would have an adverse impact, despite concerns raised by the conservation officer and the Brockley Society.
- 6.17 Overall, the proposed works reflect the historic character of the dwelling and introduce a modern aspect that is complimentary to the character of the dwelling and therefore would result in an improvement in the appearance of the dwelling.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.18 For areas of stability and managed change, Core Strategy Policy 15 states that small household extensions and adaptations to existing housing will need to be designed to protect neighbour amenity.
- 6.19 DM Policy 30 states that residential extensions adjacent to dwellings should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity (including sunlight and daylight) to adjoining houses and their back gardens.
- 6.20 No objections have been received from nearby residents. Details of the potential light spillage of this proposal have been provided and the glazing proposed would act to reduce the effects of spillage on the amenity of nearby residents.

- 6.21 As stated in the previous application, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a loss of light and outlook to neighbouring properties, as the rear of the property is approximately west facing.
- 6.22 The balcony has been removed from the last application, which would limit the potential noise impacts as it has now been replaced with openable windows. Further, the glass panels on the side of the roof extension would be opaque units, this would prevent overlooking impacts to adjoining residents. Whilst the panels to the rear are not proposed to be opaque, the properties to the rear on Upper Brockley Road are approximately 40m away.
- 6.23 Therefore, the proposed would not be expected to have an unreasonably adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents and therefore the proposed extension is consistent with Core Strategy Policy 15 and DM Policy 30.

Equalities Considerations

- 6.24 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 6.25 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to:
- (a) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
 - (c) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 6.26 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 6.27 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>
- 6.28 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

6.29 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

6.30 The planning issues set out above do not include any factors that relate specifically to any of the equalities categories set out in the Act, and therefore it has been concluded that there is no impact on equality.

Conclusion

7.0 The Local Planning Authority has considered the particular circumstances of the application against relevant planning policy set out in the Development Management Local Plan (2014), the Core Strategy (2011) The London Plan (2015, as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

8.0 In summary, the proposed works are considered to be appropriate in scale, form and materials and to preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling and the Brockley Conservation area, without impacting adversely on residential amenity, in accordance with DM policies 30, 31 & 36 and Core Strategy Policies 8, 15 and 16.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2) The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

7468_00; 7468_01; 7468_02; 7468_03; 7468_04; 7468_05; 7468_06; 7468_09; 7468_11 and the Design & Access Statement (February 2015, JAK) received 11th February 2015; Heritage Statement (March 2015, JAK) received 24th March 2015; 7468_15; 7468_16 received 27th June 2015; Light Spillage Calculations 1 & 2 received 23rd July 2015; 7468_08; 7468_10 received 10th August 2015; 7468_07; 7468_12; 7468_13 (Proposed 3D Visualisation); 7468_13 (Proposed Sightline Analysis) received 11th August 2015.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

- 3) No development shall commence on site until a sample of the proposed glazing to be used on the extension has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building(s) and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

- 4) (a) Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, no development shall commence until detailed plans at a scale of at least 1:10 showing how the extension would join the ridgeline have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

(b) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the detailed treatment of the proposal, to ensure that the proposal would be delivered as designed and to ensure that it would not project above the height of the ridge of the main roof and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

- 5) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no plumbing or pipes shall be fixed on the rear roofslope extension.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and to ensure that the scheme is delivered as designed and to accord with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

INFORMATIVES

Positive and Proactive Statement: The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.