

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE A	
Report Title	34 Granville Park, London, SE13 7EA	
Ward	Blackheath	
Contributors	Andrew Harris	
Class	PART 1	31 March 2016

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/15/93983
<u>Application dated</u>	05.10.2015
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr Stephen Jenkins on behalf of Mr & Mrs Joris & Kathryn Klaentschi
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a part single/part two storey extension, together with a single storey side extension to the lower ground and ground floors at 34 Granville Road SE3.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	2598-100 REV A; 2598-102 REV A; 2598-030; 2598-014; 2598-013; 2598-015; 2598-012; 2598-010; 2598-105; 2598-103; 2598-104; 2598-106; 2598-031; Heritage Statement & Design & Access Statement October 2015.
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File LE/127/34/TP (2) Core Strategy (2011) (3) Development Management Local Plan (2014) (4) The London Plan (2015)
<u>Designation</u>	PTAL 4 Blackheath Conservation Area Area of Special Character

## **1.0 Property/Site Description**

- 1.1 The application site is a four-storey, including lower ground floor, semi-detached property located on the northwestern side of Granville Park. The application site's lawful use is flats, but the applicant has advised it is currently being used as a single-family dwellinghouse.
- 1.2 The high status, Italianate style Victorian villa is built in London stock brick with stucco detailing to the doors and windows. The design is strictly symmetrical and the size and type of openings express the traditional hierarchy between individual floors that is typical for both the status and period the house was built.
- 1.3 The application site features a two-storey bay window to the rear elevation, as well as a three-storey closet return. To the side elevation is a small shed that has limited visibility from the front elevation.
- 1.4 Hard standing for vehicle parking is located to the front elevation.

- 1.5 The application site is located within the Blackheath Conservation Area, but is not a listed building. The site is also located within an Area of Special Character.
- 1.6 The immediately surrounding area is residential in character comprising of similarly designed semi-detached properties and some more recent flatted developments.

## **2.0 Planning History**

- 2.1 1980 – Formation of an access and a hard standing area in the front garden of No. 34. Application permitted.
- 2.2 1974 – Conversion of the three-storey with semi-basement, semi-detached property at 34 Granville Park, into 1, five-roomed, self-contained maisonette on the lower two floors and 1, four-roomed, self-contained maisonette on the upper two floors, together with the erection of a three-storey staircase extension on the flank wall. Application permitted.

## **3.0 Current Planning Application**

### The Proposal

- 3.1 The application seeks permission for the construction of a part single/part two-storey extension, together with a single storey side extension to the lower ground and ground floors. It is also proposed to excavate a terrace area at lower ground floor level to the rear elevation.
- 3.2 It is proposed to construct a full width lower ground floor extension, with a depth of 1.8 metres. It is also proposed to extend the depth of the existing closet return to upper ground floor level by 1.2 metres. The extension to the closet would be finished with a flat roof. The extension would cover up the window cil at first floor level.
- 3.3 It is proposed to insert large sliding doors to the rear elevation of the lower ground floor extension as well as a single door. To the upper ground floor, the extended closet would feature an additional single door. A set of stairs are proposed to the rear of the door to provide access to the garden from the upper ground floor.
- 3.4 It is also proposed to construct a lower ground floor side extension with a depth of 11.8 metres and a setback from the front elevation of 0.3 metres. To the front elevation the side extension would feature a single door and two high level windows are proposed for the flank elevation.
- 3.5 The extensions are proposed to be constructed of brickwork to match existing.
- 3.6 It is also proposed to enlarge the existing rear light well at lower ground floor level to the rear elevation. The enlarged light well would form a paved rear terrace at lower ground floor level with steps providing access to garden level above. The terrace would have an overall area of 30sqm.
- 3.7 It is noted that the house is being converted from flats to re-establish a single family dwelling house, these works are permitted development and do not form part of the considerations in this report.

## Supporting Documents

3.8 The applicant has submitted the following supporting documents:

- Heritage Statement & Design & Access Statement dated October 2015 – the Heritage Statement & Design & Access Statement provides a summary of the Blackheath Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Supplementary Planning Document and key characteristics of the Blackheath Conservation Area. The statement also provides a description of the application site and the proposal providing details with regard to the design, materials and access arrangements.

## **4.0 Consultation**

4.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

4.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and businesses in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors.

### Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

4.3 Six objections were received as a result of the consultation undertaken. Four objections were received from surrounding residents, one objection was received from the local amenity group, the Blackheath Society and one objection was received from the Amenities Society Panel. The following provides a summary of the objections:

#### 4.4 30 Granville Park

- The altered street view of the proposed side extension contravenes Lewisham's Heritage Statement;
- The Heritage & Design & Access Statement is incorrect in that it states there is no reference to the application property or similar adjacent properties within the Blackheath Character Appraisal and Supplementary Planning Document. This is incorrect and there is reference made to Granville Park within the document.

#### 4.5 32 Granville Park:

- The works would have a negative impact on the view of the property from the street;
- The works do not respect the original design and would result in visual harm;
- The side extension will impact very negatively on the front elevation of the building. The design lacks quality detailing that would relieve the plainness of the addition;
- The side extension achieves very little in terms of additional accommodation and the spaces created could easily be accommodated elsewhere in the building;

- The side extension would reduce light to the side windows and glazed doors of No. 32 Granville Park;
- The style of the new windows in the side elevation are out of character with existing;
- Object to the use of powder-coated aluminium for the new windows and rear door;
- The works are of poor quality;
- The proposed extension to the rear is of significant size and it is not clear what alterations to the landscaping/ garden is proposed;
- No information has been provided with regard to the treatment of the front garden area.

#### 4.6 1C Eliot Park

- It is concerning that this extension is built into garden space;
- The design is not in keeping with the Victorian design on the road;
- An environmental survey should be undertaken to ascertain the effects upon issues such as bat foraging sites as there are active colonies close by;
- The works would have a negative impact on the view of the property from the street;
- The works do not respect the original design and would result in visual harm;
- The side extension will impact very negatively on the front elevation of the building. The design lacks quality detailing that would relieve the plainness of the addition;
- The side extension achieves very little in terms of additional accommodation and the spaces created could easily be accommodated elsewhere in the building;
- The side extension would reduce light to the side windows and glazed doors of No. 32 Granville Park;
- The style of the new windows in the side elevation are out of character with existing;
- Object to the use of powder-coated aluminium for the new windows and rear door;
- The works are of poor quality;
- The proposed extension to the rear is of significant size and it is not clear what alterations to the landscaping/ garden is proposed;

- No information has been provided with regard to the treatment of the front garden area.

#### 4.7 25 Granville Park

- The proposed works would be detrimental to the integrity of the road which is a good example of Victorian architecture;
- The side extension provides little additional accommodation;
- The extension encroaches on the garden;
- The quality of the works is poor;
- Metal framed windows and doors are not appropriate for a Victorian house.

#### 4.8 The Blackheath Society:

- The extension is poor and unsympathetic;
- The absence of detailed plans for the proposed rear elevation makes the application very problematic;
- The design should be reconsidered to ensure that any development complements the existing house and is less intrusive.

4.9 The Amenities Society Panel also objected to the scheme due to its poor and unsympathetic design.

4.10 Copies of representations received are available to Members.

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

#### Core Strategy

- 5.7 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 cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

## Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

### Development Management Local Plan

5.8 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:

5.9 The following policies are considered to be 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 32	Housing design, layout and space standards
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 (2006/ Update 2012)

5.10 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.

### Blackheath Conservation Area Appraisal (2007)

5.11 This document identifies the special characteristics of the Blackheath conservation area with the intention that these special characteristics are preserved or enhanced. The document provides details on the history of the area, its spatial character, the prevailing and former uses within the area, relationship to surrounding areas, public spaces and trees and natural boundaries, views, vistas and panoramas, areas of distinct character, architectural character and materials and details.

## **6.0 Planning Considerations**

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

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design
- c) Residential Amenity
- d) Impact on Adjoining Properties

## e) Commentary on Representations Received

### Principle of Development

- 6.2 The proposed development would constitute the enlargement of a dwelling house within a residential area and would therefore be acceptable in principle.

### Design

- 6.3 Core Strategy Policy 15 relates to high quality design and 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 Core Strategy Policy 16 relates to conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment and states that the Council will ensure that the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets and their settings 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.
- 6.5 DM Policy 30 relates to urban design and local character and states that the Council will require all development proposals to attain a high standard of design. Planning applications will need to demonstrate the quality and durability of building materials and their sensitive use in relation to the context of the development. Materials used should be high quality and either match or complement existing development, and the reasons for the choice of materials should be clearly justified in relation to the existing built context.
- 6.6 DM Policy 31 relates to alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions. It 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, and 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. In addition, 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.
- 6.7 Side extensions should normally be set back and down from the main building line to allow for a clear break between existing buildings and the new work in order to maintain architectural subordination to the original building.
- 6.8 Rear extensions will generally not be permitted where any part is higher than the height of the ridge of the main roof, or where the extension is not set back into the roof slope. It also states that extensions will not be permitted where they would adversely affect the architectural integrity of a group of buildings as a whole or cause an incongruous element in terms of the important features of a conservation area.
- 6.9 DM Policy 36 relates to 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. DM Policy 36 states that the Council will not grant planning permission in conservation areas where new development or 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.

- 6.10 The residential standards supplementary planning document provides guidance on rear extensions and states that the main issues for consideration when assessing extensions is:
- 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 of the effect of the building and the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring property;
  - A suitably sized garden should be maintained.
- 6.11 With regard to materials, the SPD states that bricks and roofing materials used to construct an extension should match those used in the original building. The Council will also support the use of modern materials in appropriate circumstances.
- 6.12 With regard to side extensions the SPD states in order to ensure that a side extension appears subsidiary to the main building a setback may be used which should be followed through to the roof which should be similarly setback. The setback should be at least 300mm, but the depth might need to vary considerably dependent on the nature of the urban form of the street.
- 6.13 It is proposed to construct a single-storey side extension at lower ground floor level. The side extension would be visible from the public realm. The application site sits on a hill with Granville Park below. The side extension would have a width of 2 metres, a depth of 11.8 metres and a height of 2.2 metres when measured from garden level and 3.2 metres when measured from lower ground floor level.
- 6.14 The application site forms part of a semi-detached pair and therefore the extensions/ alterations need to be considered against the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. In this case, given the side extensions limited height, lower ground floor location and the 0.3 metre setback from the front elevation the side extension would appear as a subordinate addition. The extension would not harm the symmetry of the semi-detached pair, nor appear intrusive in the streetscene. The works would retain the spacious character of the street, established by the spaces between dwellings. The side extension would not harm the character or appearance of the application site or wider Conservation Area.
- 6.15 The side extension would have a limited width of 2 metres and a limited height above garden level of 2.2 metres. The host property is a large four-storey property and the small single storey side extension would appear as a subordinate addition when viewed from the front elevation. The extension would retain the spacious character of the street, established by the spaces between dwellings.
- 6.16 The side extension would also be partially screened from view by the brick front boundary wall. Single-storey side extensions are also seen elsewhere on

properties along Granville Park, including No. 30 Granville Park. As such, the extension is not considered to be out of keeping with the surrounding area. Nor would it introduce an incongruous addition to the established street scene.

- 6.17 It is also proposed to construct a single-storey, lower ground floor full width rear extension. The property features a double height bay window to the rear elevation at lower ground/ ground floor as well as a three-storey closet extension. The lower ground floor extension would have a width of 4 metres, a depth of 1.8 metres and a height of 3.2 metres and given the location to the rear would not be visible from the public realm and as such, it would not harm the established street scene. The proposed extension would have a limited projection above garden level and would have a limited depth. It is considered that the rear extension would appear as a clearly subordinate addition and adheres with the above guidance. The extension would also have a reduced impact on the appearance of the host building when viewed from the rear due to its partial subterranean location. The use of facing brickwork to match existing is welcomed.
- 6.18 The use of sliding doors and a modern glazed door within the rear elevation of the lower ground floor extension is also acceptable in this instance. The use of modern fenestration clearly differentiates the extension as a modern addition and is considered to be an appropriate architectural response to the building. The windows would be set in line with those on the upper levels and therefore retain the hierarchy of the rear elevation.
- 6.19 The proposed extension to the side and rear elevation would be simple in design with a flat roof and constructed of brick to match existing. It is considered that this design and material is appropriate in this location and would ensure the extension successfully integrates with the host building. Whilst the use of sliding doors are not a traditional choice for fenestration, the sliding doors would have limited visibility above garden level and would not be visible from any public viewpoint and as such their inclusion in the scheme is not considered to harm the character or appearance of the building or wider conservation area.
- 6.20 A timber door is proposed for the front elevation of the side extension. This would be the only fenestration visible from the public realm. Whilst timber framed windows and doors would be the more traditional choice of fenestration, it is considered that the use of powder-coated aluminium is acceptable as it would be only used within the new extension and not to replace any existing timber framed fenestration on the original building.
- 6.21 It is also proposed to extend the depth of the existing closet return at upper ground floor level to match the extension seen at the adjoining semi-detached property, 36 Granville Park. It is considered, given the context of the site, and a similar existing extension at No. 36 Granville Park that the works would be in keeping with the existing semi-detached pair and would not harm the character or appearance of the application site. The proposed closet extension also adheres to the above guidance with regard to rear extensions.
- 6.22 The loss of the original window cil at first floor level is regrettable, however, it is considered appropriate that the proposed upper ground floor extension mimics that at No. 36 Granville Park to promote a sense of uniformity and taking into account the location at the rear would not be visible from the public realm.

- 6.23 It is also proposed to relocate an existing set of stairs that provide access to the rear garden from upper ground floor level. The stairs would be moved slightly back within the rear garden from their existing position. Balustrade to a height of 1.4 metres would be provided to each side of the stairs. The balustrade would be constructed of frameless glass. The use of frameless glass is acceptable as it would have a limited visual impact on the appearance of the building. The design of the staircase would be similar to existing and would not harm the character or appearance of the building.
- 6.24 It is also proposed to extend the existing rear light well. The works would involve excavating at lower ground floor level for a depth of 3 metres and a width of 6.3 metres. The excavated area would be paved and a set of stairs would provide access up to the rear garden. The works are considered to be acceptable as they would not be visible from any public vantage point. In addition, the paved area does not take up an excessive portion of the garden and the design would be suitable for the rear garden setting.
- 6.25 The subject site benefits from a sizeable rear garden of approximately 137sqm. The works including both the side and rear extensions and paved terrace would result in an additional 56sqm of hard landscaping. It is not considered that these works would take up excessive portions of the rear garden. The host building would still retain a large portion of soft landscaped rear garden available for use by residents.
- 6.26 In conclusion, the bulk, scale and massing of the side and rear extensions are considered to be acceptable. The extensions would appear as subordinate additions to host dwelling and respect existing floor levels. As such, the works are not considered to harm the character or appearance of the application site or surrounding Blackheath conservation area.

#### Residential Amenity

- 6.27 DM Policy 31 states that new rooms provided by extensions to residential buildings will be required to meet the space standards in DM Policy 32. DM Policy 32 provides guidance on internal space standards for new development and states that the standards in the London Plan should be used to assess whether new housing development provides an appropriate level of residential quality and amenity.
- 6.28 The side extension would provide an entrance lobby as well as a small WC. Both these rooms are provided with a window. The lower ground rear extension creates additional space for the existing family room. This room would be provided with large sliding doors that ensure it would receive adequate ventilation and sunlight, despite its lower ground floor level location. The upper ground floor closet extension provides additional space for an existing utility room.
- 6.29 As such, the new rooms created or extended by the side and rear extensions would provide an appropriate level of amenity for future occupants.

#### Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.30 One of the Core Planning Principles identified at paragraph 17 of the NPPF is that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

- 6.31 DM Policy 31 states that residential extensions, roof terraces, balconies, and non-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. Residential extensions should retain an accessible and useable private garden that is appropriate in size in relation to the size of the property, and retains 50% of the garden area.
- 6.32 The subject site benefits from a rear garden and the proposed extensions do not have an adverse impact on the accessibility or usability of the garden and at least 50% of the garden area is retained.
- 6.33 The side extension is setback 1.3 metres from the boundary with No. 32 Granville Park. This setback and lower ground floor location of the extension is considered to ensure the proposal would not adversely affect daylight, sunlight, outlook or sense of enclosure for any adjoining property.
- 6.34 A door is proposed for the front elevation of the side extension, whilst two high level windows are proposed for the flank elevation. These flank elevation windows would sit 0.2 metres above garden level and provide light to a WC and entrance hall. As such, it is not considered that these flank windows would result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. The door to the front elevation would overlook the street only and would not cause any loss of privacy.
- 6.35 The lower and upper ground floor rear extensions would be built to the boundary with No. 36 Granville Park. The works would not project past an existing two-storey closet extension at No. 36 Granville Park that adjoins the application site. As such, the proposal would have no impact on levels of daylight, sunlight, outlook or sense of enclosure for any adjoining property.
- 6.36 Three new doors are proposed for the rear elevation of the lower ground and upper ground floor rear extension. These doors would overlook the rear garden of the site and would not result in the loss of privacy for any adjoining property.
- 6.37 A set of stairs are also proposed to provide access from the new upper ground floor door to the garden level below. The landing would have a limited depth of 1.4 metres and would not result in any overlooking above which already occurs from the existing rear staircase, which is located in a similar location to the staircase proposed. The landing would also have a limited projection above garden level at 1 metre.
- 6.38 With regard to concerns raised that the works would reduce light to No. 32 Granville Park, the side extension would be set back by a minimum of 1.3 metres from the boundary with No. 32 Granville Road to the north. The side extension would project no more than 1.6 metres above garden level height where it adjoins No. 32 Granville Park. Due to the orientation of the block, the limited height of the extension and the existing overshadowing caused by the four-storey building itself it is not considered that any overshadowing to occur to No. 32 Granville Park would be to a harmful degree
- 6.39 In conclusion, the proposed extensions would not result in any loss of daylight or sunlight, increased sense of enclosure, loss of outlook or reduction in privacy for any adjoining residential property.

#### Other Matters

- 6.40 Regarding the concern raised that the space created by the side extension is unnecessary, this is not a planning matter. So long as the extension is acceptable with regards to design, and the uses contained within the extension are ancillary to the main dwelling house, it is not a planning concern as to whether the works are necessary or not. In this case, the design of the proposed side extension is acceptable and the uses contained within the extension would be ancillary to the main dwelling house. As such, the side extension and space created by it are acceptable in principle.
- 6.41 Concern has been raised that the applicant should undertaken an environmental survey to ascertain the effects upon issues such as bat foraging sites as there are active colonies close by.
- 6.42 The application site is an urban residential garden, which is not known to the Council to contain bats, as a foraging/roosting site or within a designated protected area (Site of Nature Conservation Importance, Local Nature Reserve (LNR) or Green Corridor). The proposed development would not modify or disturb the eaves or roof space of the existing property nor is within the proximity to woodland or a watercourse and will not adversely impact bats.
- 6.43 Given the scale of the development and that it is located in the garden area closest to the existing property, the potential impact on wildlife habitats is considered minimal. Although the development would require the removal of shrubs and some small trees, these are not of a quality to support the roosting of bats. The remainder of the existing garden will remain as garden land.
- 6.44 Given this and the scale of the development, it would not result in adverse impacts or harm to bats, bat roosts or the natural environment.

## **7.0 Community Infrastructure Levy**

- 7.1 The above development is not CIL liable.

## **8.0 Equalities Considerations**

- 8.1 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;
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 8.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 8.3 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.

8.4 In this matter there is no impact on equality

## **9.0 Conclusion**

9.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.

9.2 In this case, the development does not conflict with the relevant policies of the development plan. Therefore officers consider the development to be acceptable and recommend that planning permission is granted.

## **10.0 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:

2598-100 REV A; 2598-102 REV A; 2598-030; 2598-014; 2598-013; 2598-015; 2598-012; 2598-010; 2598-105; 2598-103; 2598-104; 2598-106; 2598-031; Heritage Statement & Design & Access Statement dated 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) No new external finishes, including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing.

Reason: To ensure that the high design quality demonstrated in the plans and submission is delivered so that local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building 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) 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).

### **INFORMATIVES**

- (1) 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.