

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	1 Heathfield Gardens, London, SE3 OUS	
Ward	Blackheath	
Contributors	Simon Vivers	
Class	PART 1	3 May 2016

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/15/93137
<u>Application dated</u>	19 October 2015
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr Nigel Treisse align GB Interiors Limited
<u>Proposal</u>	Construction of a single storey side and front extension at lower ground floor, together with removal of tree within the front setback and construction of a side extension at first floor level at 1 Heathfield Gardens, SE3
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	[G] 120 Rev P2, [G] 101 Rev P2, [R] 103 Rev P2, [B] 115 Rev P4, [1] 102 Rev P5, [B] 100 Rev P2, [B] 105 Rev P2, [R] 104 Rev P2, [B] 116 Rev P2, Q 37 Green Roof, Daylight and Sunlight Study (Specification and Maintenance Document) (received 28 July 2015), [G] 001 Rev P1, [B] 110 Rev P1 (received 24 August 2015), [G] 106 Rev P6, [LG] 117 Rev 0, Design, Access and Heritage Statement (received 13 January 2016)
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File DE/676/C/TP (2) Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (adopted November 2014)
<u>Designation</u>	PTAL 2/3 Areas of Special Character Blackheath Conservation Area Not a Listed Building Unclassified Road

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application relates a three storey plus basement property situated on the southern side of Eliot Vale. The property is part of a group of three terrace properties, and sits end of row on the eastern end.
- 1.2 Numbers 1 to 3 Heathfield Gardens (together with 4 Baizdon Road) have been constructed as an infill development in 1997, and use a traditional palette of materials and are of traditional design and appearance.
- 1.3 The subject site has a slope from east to west, and also north to south (away from Eliot Vale). The site has been cut out at the front and eastern side and provides a level side and rear garden which sits lower than Heathfield House to the east. Heathfield House comprises a five storey mid twentieth century block with windows facing towards the flank of the application property. The more eastern part of Heathfield House is Grade II listed, however the part neighbouring to the subject site is not listed or locally listed.

- 1.4 Two points of access are provided at the front of the property, with a main entrance at ground floor and a separate entrance to lower ground floor. The front boundary treatment provides a low yellow brick wall with piers and pedestrian gates, topped with capping stones painted white. Off street parking is provided at the rear of the property, which is accessed from Baizdon Road.
- 1.5 An original two storey projection is located at the side of the property, and has dimensions of 2m (width) x 4m (depth) x 6.3m (height).
- 1.6 The site contains an existing outbuilding (shed) which is situated to the side of the dwelling, behind the boundary fence at the side of the building.
- 1.7 An Ornamental Pear tree approximately 15 years old is situated in the front setback of the site.
- 1.8 The property lies within the Blackheath Conservation Area, and is not subject to an Article 4 direction.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 DC/96/40786: The erection of a three storey four bedroom detached house and a two storey terrace with semi-basement and mansard roofstorey to provide 3 four-bedroom houses on land at the corner of Eliot Vale and Baizdon Road SE3 together with the erection of a block of 3 garages and the provision of 4 carparking and vehicular access onto Baizdon Road (planning permission granted 23 September 1997). A fourth dwelling was subsequently approved on Baizdon Road, which forms part of the overall development.
- 2.2 DC/14/89757: Demolition of the garden shed to the side of 1 Heathfield Gardens SE3, the construction of a single storey extension at lower ground floor level to the side to provide an annex, the construction of an extension at first floor level at the side incorporating a roof terrace above with steel balustrade railings, the construction of a dormer extension to the side roof slope, together with the part demolition of the front boundary wall and the installation of sliding gates in connection with the provision of an off-street parking space. (planning permission refused 16th April 2015).

This application was refused to due the dormer extension, roof terrace and balustrade being inappropriate and visually obtrusive, and also due to the adverse amenity impact which would be caused the residents of the neighbouring property (Heathfield House) due to an increased overlooking and an unreasonable loss of privacy.

3.0 Current Planning Application

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for the following works:
- Construction of an extension at lower ground floor to the side and front of the property; and
 - Construction of a first floor extension to the eastern side of the property.
- 3.2 The side extension at first floor level would sit directly above the existing two storey projection (thus creating a side projection over three levels, from lower ground floor through to first floor). The height at the side would be increased from 6.3m to 9.1m.

Two windows are proposed, facing towards the front and rear of the site. The extension would have a flat asphalt roof, sitting level with the main roofline (below the mansard roof).

- 3.3 The lower ground floor extension is described as an “Annex” in the Design, Access & Heritage Statement and involves the provision of an additional kitchen, living and dining area and bedroom. The lower ground floor extension is split into two forms.
- 3.4 Towards the front, the extension will infill the north eastern corner of the garden between the front and side property boundaries and the external stair access/light well to the lower ground floor. An additional access would also be proposed providing direct access from street level. The extension would sit 0.5m below the base of the solid front boundary fence, and would have a living roof located above. The construction of this part of the extension requires removal of the Ornamental Pear tree within the front setback.
- 3.5 At the side, the proposal would continue rearward from the front extension, adjacent to the eastern boundary. A courtyard space would be established between the extension and existing host building. The ground level of the garden is 3.3m lower than the neighbouring land to the east. The proposal would require the build up of the existing boundary wall by an additional 0.8m (and would remain below the sill height of windows of Heathfield House to the east). This wall is shown to carry through the yellow brick wall and capping of the front boundary. A mixed green roof is proposed for the bulk of the roof, however a glazed roof would be located in the western part of the extension, behind the existing side projection. The extension includes timber cladding and bi-fold doors which face towards the host building.
- 3.6 The living roof at the front has a 200mm substrate depth, is proposed to be predominately grassed and also have shrubs located that the eastern boundary. The green roof at the side of the property varies in depth from 200mm – 400mm and is proposed to be an intensive shrub roof with wildflowers. A parapet wall level with the front building line would separate each living roof, and is also shown to match the detailing of the front boundary wall.
- 3.7 Supporting Documents:
- Design, Access and Heritage Statement
 - Living Roof specification document (prepared by Blackdown Horticultural Consultants Ltd)
 - Daylight and Sunlight Study (prepared by Right of Light Consulting)

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 Adjoining occupiers, The Blackheath Society, and Blackheath Ward Councillors were consulted as part of the application. A site notice was displayed and a newspaper advertisement was also run.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

Five objections were received. The objectors are residents of flats within Heathfield House to the east of the subject site. Grounds of objection are summarised as follows:

Amenity

- Loss of daylight/sunlight and overshadowing toward the neighbouring property to the east (Heathfield House);
- Noise nuisance if living roof is used as additional external amenity space; and
- Loss of privacy through introduced overlooking from the living roof towards side windows of Heathfield House (if used as additional external amenity space).

Safety and Security

- Loss of safety and security to properties within Heathfield House through the living roof providing an access route from the street.

Design

- Overdevelopment of the site / garden grabbing.

General

- Resubmission of the daylight/sunlight from the application which was refused;
- The daylight/sunlight assessment omits that sensitive rooms within Heathfield House may be darkened (through blinds and shutters) in order to achieve adequate privacy;
- General similarity to the previously refused scheme;
- Lack of detail available online regarding the mixed green roof construction and its use as an outdoor area; and
- Risk that windows side windows may be installed to the flank wall at first floor level, which would face towards Heathfield House.

Objection was also raised with regards to the installation a roof terrace and the formation of doors to the terrace at roof level, however these elements have not been applied for (and relate to the previously refused application).

5.0 Policy Context

Introduction

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)

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

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)'.

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.

London Plan (March 2016)

On the 15th March 2015, the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) was adopted. However, on the 14th March 2016, the London Plan was updated to include the Housing Standards and Parking Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan. The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:

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

Core Strategy

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 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 Local Plan

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:

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

- 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, updated 2012)

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 character appraisal and supplementary planning document March 2007

The group of properties is located at the western boundary of Character Area 1F: Eliot Place.

The appraisal states:

Eliot Vale rises onto the Heath to become Eliot Place. This long group of individual houses is on a grand scale (up to three and four storeys) and forms part of the distinctive and unique part of the character of the Heath enclosure. The houses cover a date range of 1796-1911 and many of them are Grade II listed.

The predominant materials are London stock bricks which from a distance are a deep beige/ brown and contrasted on earlier buildings with orange brickwork (some rubbed bricks) for dressings and gauged brick arches. Natural slate roofs are almost ubiquitous in this group. The unity of the group comes in the use of materials rather than architectural style as whilst many of the buildings are classical there are later groups and distinctive individual buildings. Variation comes in the roofline with some gables facing the Heath as well as the strong horizontal emphasis of the parapet. A particular characteristic of this group is the presence and prominence of full mansards with central shared chimneybreasts. The full height and form of these roofs make a very significant impact on the skyline profile of this group and these particular houses can be seen for some distance in views from the Heath.

This is a very high quality group forming part of the wider group of historic built form which enclose the Heath. These houses are very sensitive to change but their individuality provides interest and richness to the character of this part of the conservation area.

6.0 Planning Considerations

6.1 The main planning considerations for this application are:

- a) design and scale and its impact on the host building and the character and setting of neighbouring buildings and conservation area; and
- b) impact that the proposal has on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design & Scale

- 6.2 Urban design is a key consideration in the planning process. The NPPF makes it clear that national government places great importance on the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.
- 6.3 In respect of determining planning applications relating to heritage assets, NPPF paragraph 131 advises that:
- “local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”*
- 6.4 London Plan and Core Strategy design policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality urban design, whilst the Development Management Local Plan, most specifically DM Policy 30 and 31, seeks to apply these principles. The Council’s Residential standards SPD provides officers with further detailed guidance to apply to such residential proposals.
- 6.5 DM Policy 30 supports the Core Strategy as it sets out detailed principles to support good urban design in the borough and the Council will require alterations to existing buildings to attain a high standard of design. The policy also addresses detailed design issues and states that planning applications must demonstrate the creation of a positive relationship to the existing townscape to preserve an urban form which contributes to local distinctiveness, such as building features. Furthermore, building materials used should be of high quality and either match or complement the existing development.
- 6.6 DM Policy 31 sets out more specifically how to achieve good quality alterations to existing buildings and states that proposals for alterations 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.
- 6.7 DM Policy 36 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 are incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.
- 6.8 Chapter 6 of the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006, updated 2012) sets out Council’s expectations for the design of householder extensions. Rear extensions should reflect and enhance the appearance of the house and be smaller and lower than the original building. Side extensions should be subsidiary to the main building, and not cause disruption to a distinctive or regular street pattern. While the use of traditional building materials is encouraged, modern materials are supported in appropriate circumstances.
- 6.9 No objections have been raised by Council’s conservation officer with regards to the first floor side extension. This extension demonstrates subservience in character to the host building, with the extension relating directly to the projection below, being appropriately set back from the main building line and set below the main roof line. Due to the sufficient 5m setback which would remain to the property to the east, the extension would not give rise to a terracing effect on the streetscene.

- 6.10 A similar side extension has occurred above the original side projection at 3 Heathfield Gardens. The extension at hand would match this, thus overall adding symmetry to each end of the group of buildings. Windows at a both front and rear match proportions and location of those below, which would also be consistent with the first floor side extension at 3 Heathfield Gardens.
- 6.11 The first floor level side extension is shown to use materials which will replicate those used in the original building. It is recommended that a condition is applied requiring all works of this element of the proposal to match the existing dwelling.
- 6.12 The lower ground floor extension relates to a large three storey (plus basement) property, and does not overwhelm the proportions of the host building. The modern architectural design of the extension would contrast to the existing character of the dwelling, however this is considered to be acceptable for the site and property characteristics, and would be of a modest impact given the lower ground floor location.
- 6.13 The subject site benefits from the existing cut out of the site from the front and side boundaries. While the living roofs of the proposal would be visible, they would not add to the scale and form of the property when viewed from street. The proposed glazed roof within the lower ground floor extension would be partially visible from the Eliot Vale, however as this element is to be located between two modern additions to the conservation area and mostly hidden by the host building, it is not considered to have a significant visual impact on the host building, adjoining properties or the wider conservation area.
- 6.14 The subject property is a much later addition to the conservation area and is not a heritage asset, however it is acknowledged that the property has been carefully designed to include the use of an architectural vernacular which is in keeping with the surrounding development and wider conservation area. It is noted that the uniform front light wells form part of the character of the group of properties. As part of that vernacular the provision of formal front gardens enclosed by boundary walls is an important element.
- 6.15 The Council's conservation officer has not objected to the side part of the lower ground floor extension, but has objected to the infilling of the part of the front garden/light well, given it would detract from the unity of design of the group of terrace buildings, result in the loss of a tree which contributes to the amenity of the area and have urbanising effect on the area. However on balance, officers consider this element of the proposal is acceptable, given this area of development would not be highly noticeable from long views, and would therefore not significantly affect the character and setting of neighbouring buildings. A suitably sized light well and access would be maintained (the bulk of the area is an under used sunken front garden, and therefore not solely serving as a light well), and where views of the living roof above the front part of the extension may occur (where overlooking the front boundary), they would not be considered to be offensive. The loss of the Ornamental Pear is considered acceptable, and would not result in the excessive harm to the existing street scene, particularly due to its relationship to a relatively new heritage asset.
- 6.16 Overall, the proposed works to the dwelling are complimentary and of acceptable design and scale, and would not cause excessive harm to the special character of the Blackheath Conservation Area.

Residential Amenity

- 6.17 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.
- 6.18 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.
- 6.19 Heathfield House is the primary neighbour to be considered, given it sits adjacent to the subject site and area of development.
- 6.20 The first floor level side extension would result in an additional storey being added to the side projection. This projection would be taken from a maximum of 6.1m to 9.3m in height (increase of 3.2m). The proposal would sit above the existing projection, and maintain the existing 5m setback between the nearest side windows of Heathfield House.
- 6.21 The applicant has submitted a daylight/sunlight report in accordance with the BRE guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight', and concludes that the proposal will have a low impact in the light receivable by neighbouring properties. Officers have reviewed the report and are satisfied with the conclusions of the report. Objections raised concern regarding the resubmission of a the report (which was associated with a previously refused application), however the report remains accurate given the extension at second floor is equivalent in terms of its scale and massing.
- 6.22 The first floor level side extension would not cause any overlooking or loss of privacy to adjoining residents, given that the proposed windows would be located at the front and rear of the extension, and therefore not establish any direct or of concern views to neighbouring properties.
- 6.23 It is considered that due to the difference in site levels between the subject property and Heathfield House, the proposed lower ground floor extension would not impact significantly on the amenity of adjoining occupiers. The lower ground floor extension will be built to the eastern boundary, and will require the build up of the side wall by 0.8m. This wall would remain below the sill height of the windows of the adjoining property at Heathfield Gardens, and it is therefore not considered to cause any significant adverse impact in terms of loss of outlook to these properties.
- 6.24 Objections received in response to the application detail the potential for noise and a loss of privacy to occur, should the living roof be occupied as an additional amenity space. It is recommended that a condition is applied to the approval which restricts the use of all flat roofed areas of the proposal as areas of additional external amenity space.
- 6.25 Objections also detail a loss of security which may occur to Heathfield House as a result of the adjacent living roof. While not a planning consideration, it was observed during the officers site inspection that opportunities currently occur for a person to gain access from the front of the Heathfield House and down its side, between the two properties. A condition is proposed which restricts access to the living roof.
- 6.26 Some light spill would occur from the glazed roof, however this is positioned well away from the adjoining boundary. Some light spill would occur, however this is considered acceptable for a domestic setting.

6.27 As described above, the proposal would not be expected to have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents and therefore the proposed works are consistent with Core Strategy Policy 15 and DM Policy 31.

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;
- (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.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 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 (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

8.2 In summary, the proposed works are considered to be appropriate in its scale, form and materials and to preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling in accordance with DM policies 1, 30, 31, 36 and Core Strategy Policies 8, 15 & 16

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:

[G] 120; [G] 101; [R] 103; [B] 115; [1] 102; [B] 100; [B] 105; [R] 104; [B] 116; Q 37 Green Roof (Specification and Maintenance Document); [G] 001; [B] 110 (received 24th of August), [G] 106 Rev P6; [LG] 117, Design, Access and Heritage Statement (received 13 January 2016)

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 in relation to the first floor level side extension, including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing building

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 details shown on plan numbers [B] 115 Rev P4, [B] 116 Rev P2 and [G] 106 Rev P6, prior to the commencement of works, details of the timber cladding to the rear elevation and the eastern garden wall and living roof dividing wall shall be 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 proposal 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, DM Policy 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and 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

- 5) (a) The development shall be constructed with a biodiversity living roof laid out in accordance with plan nos. [B] 116 Rev P2, [G] 106 Rev P6 and Q 37 Green Roof (Specification and Maintenance Document) hereby approved and maintained thereafter.
- (b) The living roofs shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.
- (c) Evidence that the roof has been installed in accordance with (a) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To comply with Policies 5.10 Urban greening, 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs, 5.12 Flood risk management, 5.13 Sustainable Drainage and 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation in the London Plan (2015) , Policy 10 managing and reducing flood risk and Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- 6) The use of the flat roofed extension on the building 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).

- 7) The development hereby approved shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the associated dwelling house a 1 Heathfield Gardens and shall not be

occupied as any form of self-contained residential accommodation without the benefit of planning permission.

Reason: Any other use may have an adverse effect on the character and amenity of the area and be contrary to relevant Policies in the London Plan (2015), Core Strategy (2011) and Development Management Local Plan (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.