

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE A	
Report Title	1 Ringmore View, Ringmore Rise, London, SE23	
Ward	Forest Hill	
Contributors	Andrew Hartcher	
Class	PART 1	19 November 2015

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/15/93284
<u>Application dated</u>	10 August 2015
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr. Alex Hornby
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a two storey rear extension at 1 Ringmore View, together with the installation of 4 rooflights, an external staircase on the north side of the house and a timber deck to the rear.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	EX-000, EX-001, EX-002, EX-003, EX-004, EX-100, PL-201, PL-202, PL-203, PL-204, PL-205, Design and Statement.
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) LE/55/1/TP (2) Development Management Local Plan (adopted November 2014) and Core Strategy (adopted June 2011)
<u>Designation</u>	PTAL 1a Not in a Conservation Area Not a Listed Building
<u>Screening</u>	N/A

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The subject application relates to a single semi-detached house located at 1 Ringmore View, Ringmore Rise, SE23 3DB.
- 1.2 Ringmore view is located on Ringmore Rise near the top of Forest Hill with rear views looking north-west towards Dulwich. Ringmore Rise is a residential street consisting of mix of housing types.
- 1.3 The property slopes steeply downwards towards the east from its frontage to Ringmore View towards the rear garden of the property.
- 1.4 The house forms part of a pair with No. 2 Ringmore View and has a small single storey rear projection (7m long by 1.4m deep by 3.2m high to main ridgeline) with a low pitched roof sloping towards the rear. The house has an upper, middle and lower timber deck at the rear providing access to the rear garden. At present, a large timber panelled privacy screen is provided between the upper deck of No. 1 and No. 2 Ringmore View.
- 1.5 The upper levels of the rear of the property (first, second floors and roof/loft area) are visible from Tewkesbury Avenue, however the ground floor is predominantly

out of sight due to the lay of the land, mature trees and vegetation at the rear. The rear garden of the property is tucked away from public view due to the slope of the land and is screened well on all sides by mature trees and vegetation.

- 1.6 The property is not located within a conservation area. It is not a listed building and it is not subject to an Article 4 direction.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 **DC/00/46355** – The construction of a pair of two-storey plus roof space four-bedroom semi-detached houses fronting onto Ringmore Rise, together with the provision of a car parking space at the front of each property and the provision of new vehicular crossovers onto Ringmore Rise. **Approved November 2000.**
- 2.2 DC 15/91675 - The construction of a lower ground floor extension, ground floor extension, first floor extension and roof extension to the rear of 1 Ringmore View, Ringmore Rise SE23, together with an additional roof light in the front roof slope and alterations to the rear decking. Withdrawn July 2015.
- 2.3 DC 15/91678 - The construction of a lower ground floor extension, ground floor extension, first floor extension and roof extension to the rear of 1 Ringmore View, Ringmore Rise SE23, together with an additional roof light in the front roof slope and alterations to the rear decking. Withdrawn July 2015.
- 2.4 DC 15/93283 – Lawful development certificate for a rear loft extension and new rooflights to the front of the property. Approved October 2015.

3.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposal

- 3.1 The subject application seeks approval for the construction of a two storey rear extension at 1 Ringmore View, together with the installation of 4 rooflights, an external staircase on the north side of the house and a timber deck to the rear.
- 3.2 The proposed two-storey rear extension would include a ground floor element and a basement element.
- 3.3 The extension would be approximately 7m long and would range from 3.95m to 4.6m deep (depending on the floor level). The extension would be up to 5.8m high (excluding a 0.25m high parapet) above basement floor level and would have a flat roof on both levels.
- 3.4 The proposed extension would add 43.2m² of internal floor space to the existing property (total 177.1m²), an increase of 32%.

Basement level element

- 3.5 The basement level element of the rear extension would be 7m long by 3.95m deep by 2.9m high above basement level.
- 3.6 The basement level element of the rear extension would extend approximately 0.90m beyond the rear building line of the proposed ground floor rear extension. As above, the basement would accommodate a new sitting room.

3.7 The basement level element of the rear extension would have four glazed aluminium powder coated sliding doors on the rear elevation which would open out to a new timber deck which would be 6.2m by 2.6m at its longest and deepest points. Stairs would provide access from the deck to the rear garden.

Ground floor element

3.8 The ground floor element of the rear extension would be approximately 7m long by 4.6m deep by 2.9m high (excluding a 0.25m high parapet) with a flat roof.

3.9 Although the ground floor element of the rear extension would be 4.6m deep, it would extend 3m beyond the existing rear building line. This is because the existing 1.4m deep single storey rear projection of the property would be removed and replaced by the proposed flat roofed ground floor rear extension.

3.10 The ground floor element of the rear extension would accommodate a new dining room connecting to the existing kitchen and living room. This new space would include a staircase providing access to the new sitting room which is proposed underneath at basement level (see below).

3.11 The ground floor element of the rear extension would have a obscure glazed window on the north side, two fixed (outer) and two sliding (inner) glazed aluminium powder coated doors and a small glazed Juliette balcony on the rear elevation.

3.12 Four rooflights (2.4m long by 1.2m deep) would also be installed on the roof of the ground floor element of the rear extension. The roof would also accommodate a small exhaust flue for a fireplace which would protrude 0.43m above the flat part of the roof.

3.13 A new external staircase is also proposed on the north side of the house to provide direct access to a new timber deck below at lower ground level.

3.14 The materials used to construct the proposed extension would be as follows:

Walls (upper section)	Rendered to match existing building
Walls (lower section)	Red stock brick to match existing building
Windows	Glazed aluminium powder coated
Doors	Glazed aluminium powder coated
Roof	Single ply roof membrane
Juliette balcony	Glazed

3.15 There are no alterations proposed to the front elevation of the property.

Supporting Documents

3.16 The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.

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.

4.3 A total of 4 submissions were received, all objecting to the proposal.

Public Submissions

4.4 Three objections to the scheme were received from residents at No. 42 Tewkesbury Avenue, No. 14 Ringmore Rise and No. 2 Ringmore View.

4.5 No. 42 Tewkesbury Avenue raised the following key concerns with the proposal:

- the northern side window proposed on the rear ground floor extension would cause overlooking of the garden at No. 42. It was requested that the window be removed from the subject application.

4.6 No. 14 Ringmore Rise raised the following key concerns with the proposal:

- a lack of pre-application consultation on the proposal by the owners of the subject site and failure to display a site sign;
- the proposal would not enhance and protect the character of the streetscape;
- due to the scale of the proposal, it would significantly harm the character of the streetscape when viewed from Tewkesbury Avenue;
- the proposal would result in an overwhelming loss of privacy, an extreme sense of enclosure and a severe loss of ability to enjoy amenity (garden) space at No. 14 Ringmore Rise;
- the proposal would destroy the rear garden outlooks to the north; and
- the proposal is out of scale with the existing building, would be over-dominant and would destroy the architectural integrity of the building/s.

4.7 No. 2 Ringmore View raised the following key concerns with the proposal:

- the proposal would not enhance and protect the character of the streetscape;
- due to the elevated position of the site and the scale of the proposal, it would be over-dominant, visually intrusive and would introduce an incongruous element that would significantly harm the character of the streetscape when viewed from Tewkesbury Avenue;
- the rear ground floor extension would block out sunlight and daylight to No. 2 Ringmore View affecting the living room and outdoor deck of this property;
- the proposal would destroy the rear outlook of No. 2 Ringmore View to the north and result in an extreme sense of enclosure on the outdoor deck;
- the rear ground floor extension would result in overlooking of the rear garden of No. 2 Ringmore View leading to a loss of privacy with no screening proposed; and
- the proposal is out of scale with the existing building, would be over-dominant and would destroy the architectural integrity of the building/s.

Forest Hill Councillors

Forest Hill Councillors were consulted on the subject application and did not make a submission.

The Tewesbury Lodge Residents Association

The Tewesbury Lodge Residents Association was consulted on the subject application and objected on the following grounds:

- the proposal would not enhance and protect the character of the streetscape; and
- due to the elevated position of the site and the scale of the proposal, it would be over-dominant and visually intrusive and would significantly harm the character of the streetscape when viewed from Tewkesbury Avenue.

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 'if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the 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 in paragraph 211, that 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

- 5.5 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)

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

Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.4 Retrofitting
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- 5.7 The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

Housing (2012)
Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)

London Plan Best Practice Guidance

- 5.8 The London Plan Best Practice Guidance's relevant to this application are:

London Housing Design Guide (Interim Edition, 2010)

Core Strategy

- 5.9 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, 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 7 Climate change and adapting to the effects
Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency

Development Management Local Plan

5.10 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 Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy 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 Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

5.11 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

DM Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 3	Conversion of a single dwelling to two or more dwellings
DM Policy 22	Sustainable design and construction
DM Policy 26	Noise and vibration
DM Policy 29	Car parking
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 31	Alterations/extensions to existing buildings
DM Policy 32	Housing design, layout and space standards

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (amended 2012)

5.12 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, storage, recycling facilities and bin storage, noise insulation, parking, cycle parking and storage, gardens and amenity space, landscaping, play space, Lifetime Homes and accessibility, and materials.

6.0 Planning Considerations

6.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) Design and impact of the proposal on the subject property and surrounding area; and
- b) Impact on the amenity adjoining properties.

Design and impact on the subject property and surrounding area

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 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.

- 6.4 DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions states that development proposals for alterations and extensions, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used, appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. New rooms provided by extensions to residential buildings will be required to meet the space standards in DM Policy 32 Housing Design, layout and space standards.
- 6.5 DM Policy 31 also states that residential extensions should retain an accessible and usable private garden that is appropriate in size in relation to the size of the property, and retain 50% of the garden area.
- 6.6 Paragraph 6.2 of the Residential Standards SPD states that when considering applications for extensions the Council will look at these main issues:
- how the extension relates to the house;
 - the effect on the character of the area - the street scene and the wider area;
 - the physical impact on the host building, and the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties; and
 - a suitably sized garden should be maintained.
- 6.7 Paragraph 6.3 of the Residential Standards SPD states that bricks and roofing materials used to construct an extension should match those in the original building.
- 6.8 Paragraph 6.4 of the Residential Standards SPD states that extensions should be smaller and less bulky than the original building and reflect its form and shape. It states that traditionally, extensions to buildings are subsidiary to the main structure and that over-dominant extensions may destroy the architectural integrity of existing buildings.
- 6.9 The gross internal floor space of the existing dwelling is 133.9m². The proposed extension would add 43.2m² of internal floor space (total 177.1m²), an increase of 32% which is considered to be reasonable.
- 6.10 Public submissions did not raise any issues of concern in relation to the proposed basement element of the rear extension.
- 6.11 Due to the lay of the land, mature trees and vegetation which surround the site perimeter at the sides and rear, the basement element of the rear extension would be predominantly 'tucked away' (i.e. cut into the slope of the site) from public and private view and would not be readily visible from Tewkesbury Avenue.
- 6.12 The proposed basement element of the rear extension is considered to be of a modest size that is of an appropriate scale and proportion when compared to the existing property. Further, this element of the proposal is considered to be of a site specific and sensitive design quality that responds to topography of the site, compliments the design (e.g. use of high quality, complimentary and matching

materials) and respects the rectangular form and shape of the existing dwelling in accordance with DM Policy 31.

- 6.13 At 3m beyond the existing rear building line of the property, the ground floor element of the rear extension would essentially take up the same area currently occupied by the upper timber deck of the property.
- 6.14 At 2.9m high, the proposed ground floor element of the rear extension would be around 0.30m lower than the ridgeline of the existing single storey rear projection at the property which has a low pitched roof sloping towards the rear. The ground floor rear extension has been designed so that it is of a modest and appropriate size. It is also rectangular in shape to reflect (and provide a continuation of) the original dwelling and has a flat roof to ensure that it retains its subservience to the host dwelling.
- 6.15 In addition to the above, a suitably sized rear garden (over 50% of the existing) would be retained at the property and all materials used to construct the proposed extension have been chosen to compliment, match or improve the quality of the existing property (e.g. matching render, replacement of UPVC with aluminium powder coated windows and doors).
- 6.16 Given the above, it is concluded that the proposed extension would not result in any adverse design impact to the subject building or the character of the streetscape and would be compliant with the requirements of DM Policy 31 and the Residential Standards SPD.
- 6.17 Concern was raised in public submissions that the proposal is out of scale with the existing building, would be over-dominant and would destroy the architectural integrity of the building/s.
- 6.18 However, when considering the size of the existing property (internal floor area of 171.1m²) and the rear garden (around 17.5m deep), Council officer's are satisfied that the proposed extension is of an acceptable size and of an appropriate scale that is not overly dominant and relates well to the proportions of the existing dwelling.
- 6.19 Council officer's recognise that while the proposed extension is substantial and would impact on the appearance of the host dwelling, the building is of a contemporary style (built in 2002) that is not architecturally significant, is not located in a Conservation Area and it is not a Listed Building. Further, it is noted that while the properties at No. 1 and No. 2 Ringmore View are very similar, they are not an identical pair as the roofline (main and rear projection) of No. 2 is around 0.4m higher than No. 1 and No. 2 already has a full width rear extension at lower ground floor/basement level. As such, the impact of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and adjoining No. 2 Ringmore View is not considered to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. The symmetry and architectural integrity of buildings would be maintained at the front elevation where no changes are proposed and as discussed in further detail below, the proposed rear extension is only partially publicly visible from Tewkesbury Avenue.
- 6.20 Concern was also raised in public submissions that due to the elevated position of the site and the scale of the proposal, it would be visually intrusive and would

introduce an incongruous element that would significantly harm the character of the streetscape when viewed from Tewkesbury Avenue.

- 6.21 Council officer's have visited the site and viewed the property from Tewkesbury Avenue and note that the existing rear ground floor projection of the property is only partially visible from this avenue. This view is generally restricted to the upper section of the north-western corner of the projection and more specifically, the gutter and eaves. This is because views to this area are predominantly screened by mature trees and vegetation which surround the site perimeter at the sides and rear.
- 6.22 As the existing single storey rear projection of the property would be removed and replaced by the proposed ground floor element of the rear extension, this too would be screened by vegetation and would only be partially publicly visible from Tewkesbury Avenue. Views towards this area are also at reasonable distance of around 17m to 27m (depending on where a person stands on the road). Finally, given that the proposed ground floor element of the rear extension would be modest in size (as previously established in this report) with a flat roof that is approximately 0.30m lower than the ridgeline of the existing rear wall projection of the property, Council officer's do not consider that this element of the proposal would be over-dominant, visually intrusive or introduce an incongruous element that would significantly harm the character of the streetscape of Tewkesbury Avenue.

Impact on the Amenity Adjoining Properties

- 6.23 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.
- 6.24 DM Policy 31 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. This was an issue of concern raised in public submissions.
- 6.25 Concern was raised in public submissions that the northern side window proposed on the rear ground floor extension would cause overlooking of the garden at No. 42 Tewkesbury Avenue.
- 6.26 To negate this issue, the Applicant has amended the plans to show this window as being obscure glazed (i.e. frosted). Council officer's are therefore satisfied that the proposed extension would not result in significant overlooking of the rear garden at No. 42.
- 6.27 It is also noted that the rear elevation of No. 42 Tewkesbury Avenue is located over 14m away from the subject property. As such, Council officer's are also satisfied that the proposal would not result in any significant amenity impacts at No. 42 in terms of daylight and sunlight access, sense of enclosure, loss of outlook or overshadowing.
- 6.28 Concern was raised in public submissions that the proposal would result in an overwhelming loss of privacy, an extreme sense of enclosure and a severe loss of ability to enjoy amenity (garden) space at No. 14 Ringmore Rise and would destroy the rear garden outlooks to the north.

- 6.29 The basement level rear extension would not be visible from the garden of No. 14 Ringmore Rise and would only be partially visible from the upper floors. Therefore, this aspect of the proposal is not considered to significantly impact on the amenity of No. 14.
- 6.30 No. 14 Ringmore Rise does not adjoin the subject property but is located around 10m to the south adjoining No 2 Ringmore View (the adjoining property). Given this distance and that views of the proposed rear ground floor extension would be minimal from this location and would be predominantly screened by existing vegetation and side boundary fences, the proposal is considered unlikely to result in any significant amenity impacts in terms of daylight and sunlight access, sense of enclosure, loss of outlook, overshadowing or overlooking at No. 14 Ringmore Rise.
- 6.31 Concern was raised in public submissions that:
- the the rear ground floor extension would block out sunlight and daylight to No. 2 Ringmore View affecting the living room and outdoor deck of this property.
 - the proposal would destroy the rear outlook of No. 2 Ringmore View to the north and result in a extreme sense of enclosure on the outdoor deck; and
 - the rear ground floor extension would result in overlooking of the rear garden of No. 2 Ringmore View leading to a loss of privacy with no screening proposed.
- 6.32 Due to the siting of the property with its rear elevation facing due west, access to sunlight and daylight in the living room and on the outdoor deck at No. 2 Ringmore View is unlikely to be affected by the proposal. Further, it is noted that a large timber panelled privacy screen is currently provided between the upper deck of No. 1 and No. 2 Ringmore View. This screen would essentially be replaced by a rendered wall of similar size associated with the south elevation of the rear ground floor extension. As such, rear garden outlooks to the north from No. 14 Ringmore Rise towards the subject property would not change significantly as a result of the proposal.
- 6.33 It is also noted that the upper section of the side wall would be rendered a white/cream colour to match the existing dwelling which would reflect some additional light into the living room and onto the outdoor deck. Given the above, the proposal is not considered to result in any significant additional impacts to No. 2 Ringmore View in terms of light access, loss of outlook or sense of enclosure than the existing privacy screen.
- 6.34 The rear ground floor extension would have two fixed (outer) and two sliding (inner) glazed aluminium powder coated doors and a small glazed Juliette balcony on its rear elevation which has the potential to result in some overlooking of the rear garden of No. 2 Ringmore View leading to a loss of privacy. However, these views are likely to be minimal as they would be screened by existing vegetation on the south side boundary and would not be dissimilar to the views currently experienced from the upper deck of the subject property. Further, it is noted that due to the siting of the property, these limited views would be restricted to only a portion of the rear garden of No. 2 which is large at around 20m deep. As such, Council officer's are satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact on privacy levels in the rear garden of No. 2 Ringmore View.

Other Matters

- 6.35 A public submission raised concern that the Applicant has not put up a a site notice.
- 6.36 However, the Applicant has provided Council with a signed certificate of site notice display indicating that the site sign was put up on display at the property on 8 September 2015, five (5) days after the start of the 21 day consultation period.
- 6.37 Although the site sign was put up five (5) days late, the Applicant has advised Council that the site sign was left up for a period of 21 days from 8 September 2015.
- 6.38 In addition, Council notified all adjoining landowners of the subject application by letter inviting public submissions on 3 September 2015 and all submissions on the proposal are accepted up until an eventual Committee date.
- 6.39 Given the above, it is concluded that the minimum statutory requirements required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement have been exceeded.

7.0 Equalities Considerations

- 7.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ("the Act") imposes a duty that the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not; and
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 7.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 7.3 The duty is a "have regard duty" and the weight to attach to it is a matter for the decision maker bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality.
- 7.4 In this matter there is no impact on equality.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 8.2 Council officer's acknowledge that while the proposed extensions are sizable, they are of an acceptable scale, and proportionate to the existing property and large rear garden.
- 8.3 Council officer's are satisfied that the proposed extensions are of a site specific and sensitive design quality; would be smaller and less bulky than the original building; would respect the form and shape of the original dwelling; would be subservient to the host dwelling; would not significantly impact on the architectural

integrity or characteristics of the host dwelling/s; would be constructed using high quality, matching or complimentary materials; and would retain a suitably sized garden. The proposal would therefore be compliant with the requirements of DM Policy 31 and the Residential Standards SPD.

8.4 Finally, Council officer's are satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

8.5 As such, the proposal is recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

9.0 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:

Design and Access Statement (received 10th August 2015); EX-000, EX-001 Rev B, EX-002 Rev B, EX-003 Rev A, EX-004 Rev A, EX-010 Rev A, EX-100, PL-201 Rev C, PL-202 Rev A, PL-203, PL-204 Rev B, PL-205 Rev A (received 21 October 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.
 - (a) The development shall be constructed in those materials as submitted namely: red stock brick to match the existing building, render to match the existing building, aluminium powder coated doors and windows and in full accordance with PL-201 Rev C, PL-202 Rev A, PL-203, PL-204 Rev B and PL-205 Rev A.
 - (b) The scheme shall be carried out in full accordance with those details, as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the design is delivered in accordance with the details submitted and assessed so that the development achieves the necessary high standard and detailing in accordance with Policies 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. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofed extension hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and

no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

5. The side window on the rear extension hereby approved shall be retained with obscured glazing and fixed shut.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

6. No alterations to the extension hereby approved, whether or not permitted under Article 3 to Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) of that Order, shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

Reason: In order that, in view of the nature of the development hereby permitted, the local planning authority may have the opportunity of assessing the impact of any further development and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

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.