

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE A	
Report Title	38 ST JOHN'S VALE, LONDON, SE8 4EN	
Ward	BROCKLEY	
Contributors	Russell Brown	
Class	PART 1	25th August 2016

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/16/095825
<u>Application dated</u>	08.03.2016
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr O Boote
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a mansard roof extension together with the installation of two windows to the front and rear roofslopes at 38 St John's Vale, SE8.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	1501BS100X; 1501BS200X; 1501BS200; 1501BS201; Heritage Statement; Design and Access Statement; Location Plan Received 8th March 2016 1501_GA_100 Rev B; 1501_GA_120 Rev B Received 28th June 2016
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File DE/113/38/TP (2) Core Strategy (June 2011) (3) Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) (4) London Plan (March 2016)
<u>Designation</u>	Brookmill Road Conservation Area
<u>Screening</u>	N/A

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The site is situated on the south east side of the north eastern end of St John's Vale and comprises a two storey Victorian mid-terrace single family dwellinghouse built of London stock brick with arched timber sash windows and a London (butterfly) roof with a low stuccoed parapet, giving the impression of a flat roof when viewed from the front.
- 1.2 The roof can be seen from Brookmill Road (A2210), but not the rear elevation which features an original two storey addition with a pitched roof. To the south west of the site is the St John's station and the railway line which connects Lewisham to Central London. The mansards on Albyn Road are visible from the station platform.
- 1.3 The properties on surrounding streets (Albyn Road, Lind Street and Strickland Street) are of similar age and design, even featuring the same roofs given that they were used extensively in the 19th century. The rest of the north eastern end

of this residential street is mostly made up of Victorian terraced properties, but none have mansard roof extensions.

- 1.4 The site is located within Brookmill Road Conservation Area, is subject to an Article 4 direction, but is not a listed building nor in the vicinity of any.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

- 2.1 DC/15/91300: The construction of a mansard roof extension in the front and rear roof slopes at 38 St John's Vale SE8, together with the installation of 4 new windows in the roof. **Refused because it would, by reason of its height, appearance and excessive bulk, introduce an incongruous feature to the roofscape of the subject terrace, would create a poor relationship with adjacent terraces and would result in the loss of a historic London roof which would cause harm to the streetscape and the special characteristics of the Brookmill Conservation Area. This would be detrimental to the value and significance of the borough's designated heritage assets.**

- 2.2 Also of relevance are:

DC/15/91299: The construction of a mansard roof extension to the front and rear roof slopes at 40 St John's Vale SE8, together with the installation of 4 new windows in the roof. **Refused because it would, by reason of its height, appearance and excessive bulk, introduce an incongruous feature to the roofscape of the subject terrace, would create a poor relationship with adjacent terraces and would result in the loss of a historic London roof which would cause harm to the streetscape and the special characteristics of the Brookmill Conservation Area. This would be detrimental to the value and significance of the borough's designated heritage assets.**

DC/16/095824: A concurrent application for the construction of a mansard roof extension together with the installation of two windows to the front and rear roofslopes of the extension at 40 St John's Vale, SE8.

3.0 Current Planning Application

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the construction of a mansard roof extension with two dormer windows to the front roofslope and two dormers to the rear.
- 3.2 The mansard is proposed to have a slightly sloping roof, which would measure between 95cm and a metre above the existing front parapet and would be 4.85m wide enclosed by boundary and chimney walls rising 1.25m above the parapet, from which the mansard would be set back by 25cm. To the rear it would be at least 2.3m up from the top of the 'V-shape and it would be stepped back from the rear parapet by 50cm. The dormers would be flush with the front and rear mansard walls.
- 3.3 It would create an additional storey allowing for the provision of a double bedroom and an ensuite. The mansard extension would be constructed in slates tiles with the dormers clad in lead, the raised parapet walls would be in yellow London stock brick with lime pointing to match and it would feature timber sash windows and a rooflight.

3.4 This application has been revised in line with guidance taken from the Council's Residential Development Standards SPG, which is in draft format, mainly with regards to the mansard's set back behind front and rear parapets and retaining of the V in the rear elevation.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 Pre-application advice was sought through the Council's Duty Planner Service.

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

4.3 A site and a public notice were displayed and letters were sent to 13 adjoining residents, Brockley Ward Councillors and St John's Society.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

4.4 One reply was received from a neighbouring property raising the below concerns:

- Lack of consultation from the applicants on the re-application for the mansards.
- The minor changes do not affect the justification for the Council's previous rejections.
- The mansards would be highly visible and clearly stand out from the other properties, they would break up the roofline of the original London roof form on both the front and rear elevations and the property would cease from being two storeys.
- The reduction in height by less than 10% would not negate their direct impact upon the light from the south reaching properties and first floor front bedrooms would be overshadowed and directly overlooked by four new windows directly opposite and an entire floor level higher up.
- The solid and continuous brick and slate wall would significantly obstruct direct sunlight and view of the sky.
- The mansards would destroy the characteristic inverted rear profile of the traditional London roofs and inevitably block a significant part of the skyline for residents in Lind Street and the four new windows will overlook their gardens and bedrooms from a full floor higher than the existing first floor windows.
- The arguments made in the Design and Access Statement are incorrect.
- The maintenance of a London roof is not a reason to replace it.
- The development would not be sustainable in environmental, social or economic terms as argued by the applicant.
- Any further mansard roof developments, even at the slightly reduced scale proposed in these re-applications, would be highly detrimental to the defining character of the Brookmill Conservation Area and this special architectural heritage.

4.5 The St. John's Society endorses the construction of mansards 'in principle' across the St. John's area, with the exception of one terrace on Albyn Road (where it is considered they would be inappropriate owing to the front aspects of the properties, which are curved). They stated that they do not object to them appearing outside the area and streets where planning permission has been granted and mansards constructed, provided they adhere to the same design principles as those that are extant to ensure that the hallmark of St. John's (its

historic integrity and coherence of design) is not impinged. As such, it is their view that the present applications on St. John's Vale should be permitted, since they match the very high standards of design achieved in St. John's to date.

- 4.6 Although the application site is not within their Conservation Area, the Brockley Society objected in principle as the overall impact on these London roofs would be detrimental to the streetscape of this hitherto intact street and therefore echo the refusals of permissions previously issued.
- 4.7 The Council's Conservation Officer offered the following comments:
- "The proposals include the erection of a mansard extension, involving demolition of the existing London roof and erection of a flank gable wall. The loss of this historic roof will have a negative impact on the Brookmill conservation area as the existing London roof on this terrace helps to give the conservation area a clear characteristic roofscape, with only chimney stacks and chimney pots usually visible above the corniced parapets. The introduction of a mansard roof, dormer windows and flank gable walls will disrupt the overall composition and balance of this terrace as the consistent height and scale of the terrace roofline will be lost.
 - The change would be visible at all times of year, but particularly in winter when the trees are without leaf, in long and transverse views further along St John's Vale, Brookmill road and Albyn road due to the steep nature of St John's Vale.
 - A roof extension as proposed would introduce an incongruous feature to the roofscape of this terrace. It would detract from the cohesive character of the terrace and traditional appearance of the roofscape and would create a poor relationship with the adjacent Numbers, 36 and 42.
 - Although other mansard roofs have been granted permission within this conservation area, and surrounding roads, St John's Vale has remained unmarked by the growing number of mansard roofs and as such is an important example of the appearance, character and continuity of this historic street and the wider conservation area. Permission of this mansard would result in the setting of an unfortunate precedent likely to result in very severe cumulative attrition of the historic roofscape of remaining roads within the Brookmill conservation area.
- 4.8 As currently proposed, the development is contrary to Development Management Local Plan Policy Local Plan Policy 36 Part B Paragraph 4a since the proposed roof extension is "incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale and form". The proposed development would harm the Conservation Area. The harm caused would not be outweighed by any public benefits as required by NPPF Paragraph 134.
- 4.9 The Guidance Leaflet on Mansard roofs by Historic England, the Government's advisory body on the historic environment, advises against adding any visible extra stories to the roof of a terraced house, particularly where, amongst other things, there are no roofs above the parapet in view elsewhere along the terrace; the terrace forms an overall composition the balance of which would be upset; the existing roof structure is of historic or architectural interest; where the scale of the house or terrace would be damaged by adding extra height (this applies especially to two-storey houses and short terraces)."

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 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, Development Plan Document (DPD) (adopted in June 2011), DMLP (adopted in November 2014) and policies in the London Plan (March 2015). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14 a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary this states that (paragraph 211), policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.
- 5.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

Other National Guidance

- 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 2015 (as amended)

5.6 On 14 March 2016 the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) was updated with minor alterations. The policies relevant to this application are:

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

Core Strategy

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

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy
Spatial Policy 5 Areas of Stability and Managed Change
Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham
Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Development Management Plan

5.8 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 Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following policies are relevant to this application:-

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

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (updated May 2012)

5.9 Paragraph 6.7 (Roof Extensions) states that all roof extensions should be sensitively designed to retain the architectural integrity of the building. The following design principles should be used to achieve this:

- All roof alterations should be successfully integrated with and preserve the architectural character of the building, and be subordinate to the principal elevations.
- Planning permission is always required for roof additions in Conservation Areas.
- The type and style of windows used should be similar to those used in the main elevations and reflect their alignment.
- For Victorian and Edwardian buildings, particularly in Conservation Areas box dormers occupying a whole roof slope are unlikely to be permitted.
- Roof extensions, including dormer windows, to the front and side elevations will be resisted in favour of roof lights set into the roof slope.
- Larger roof extensions should be located on the rear elevations in order to protect the front and side elevations from substantial alteration.

- Rear roof extensions should be set back a minimum of one metre behind the lines of eaves and a minimum of 500mm from the gable, flank or party wall boundary.
- Roof extensions will not be permitted where any part of the extension will be above the height of the ridge of the main roof.
- Roof extensions should be set back into the roof slope and not be formed by building up external walls.
- The materials used for roof extensions and dormers should be compatible with the existing roof material in order to be unobtrusive and blend into the roof slope. Preferred materials are natural or simulated slates, clay tiles, zinc, lead or copper as appropriate with fascia boards in painted timber or hardwood.
- In Conservation Areas appropriate materials should be used which preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Consideration should be given to reinstating the original type of roof covering wherever possible.
- Roof extensions to Listed Buildings will be considered each on their merits, but are unlikely to be approved if they harm historic roof structures and the overall special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
- Roof lights should be fitted flush with the slate or tiles of the roof and their number on front roof slopes should be kept to the minimum necessary in order to avoid clutter.

6.0 Planning Considerations

6.1 The relevant planning considerations are the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building, on the Brookmill Road Conservation Area and on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Design and conservation

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 NPPF Section 7 Requiring good design states that the Government attaches great importance to 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. 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. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development;
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation; and
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

- 6.4 Core Strategy Policy 15 states that the Council will apply national and regional policy and guidance to ensure highest quality design and the protection or enhancement of the historic and natural environment, which is sustainable, accessible to all, optimises the potential of sites and is sensitive to the local context and responds to local character.
- 6.5 Core Strategy Policy 16 states that the Council will ensure that the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets and their settings, conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, registered historic parks and gardens and other non designated assets such as locally listed buildings, will continue to be monitored, reviewed, enhanced and conserved according to the requirements of government planning policy guidance, the London Plan policies, local policy and Historic England best practice.
- 6.6 DM Policy 30 states that the Council will require all development proposals to attain a high standard of design, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings. An adequate response to how the scheme relates to the existing street including its building frontages will be required including:
- The creation of an urban form which contributes to plot widths, building features and uses, roofscape, open space and views, panoramas and vistas, taking all opportunities for enhancement.
 - Height, scale and mass should relate to the urban typology of the area.
 - 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 should be clearly justified in relation to the existing built context.
 - A statement describing the significance of heritage asset, including its setting will be required for proposals that impact on such an asset.
- 6.7 DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions states that development proposals for alterations and 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. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used, appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.
- 6.8 DM Policy 36 states that the Council will require a statement that describes the significance of the asset and its setting and an assessment of the impact on that significance for development proposals affecting heritage assets. Also required is clear and convincing justification if the significance of an asset may be harmed or lost through physical alteration or destruction, or development within its setting. The Council encourages the retention and thermal upgrading of historic windows. The Council will not grant planning permission where:
- a. 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; or
 - b. development, which in isolation would lead to less than substantial harm to the building or area, but cumulatively would adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.9 This terrace of properties (nos. 36-42), and indeed the whole of St John's Vale, has a strong, legible character with a distinctive roofscape and most properties

retain their decorative cornice at roof level. The properties have London 'butterfly' roofs which are hidden behind a parapet when viewed from the front, giving the impression of flat roofs and 'V shaped' roofs are visible from the rear. Whilst there are some mansard on adjacent streets, including on those within the Brookmill Road Conservation Area, Officers note that there are no roof extensions, and therefore no mansards, on this street.

- 6.10 Current Council policies and guidance do not support or encourage mansard roof extensions on London 'butterfly' roofs. The proposal results in the loss of the historic roof form, which is considered unacceptable.
- 6.11 The proposed mansard roof in effect would create a second storey, replacing the V-shaped butterfly roof, set behind the parapet. By its nature, a mansard does not protect the front elevation from substantial alteration. It is considered that the additional storey would appear bulky and incongruous, dominating the streetscene. The raised party walls would be highly prominent from surrounding viewpoints and the raised chimney standing taller than any other in the street, appearing far above the height of the mansard roof ridge, contrary to the Residential Standards SPD. This would only serve to enforce the prominence of the mansard, which would not appear as being integrated into the roof of the property and therefore it would not preserve the architectural character or integrity of the building.
- 6.12 In this instance, it is considered that the proposed development fails to comply with local plan policies, specifically DM Policies 30 (parts 5a and b) and 31 (parts 1, 2b and 3) and guidance in the Residential Standards SPD which seek to ensure that roof extensions are of high, site specific and sensitive design quality and also respect and complement the form of the host building.

Impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers

- 6.13 DM Policy 31 states that residential development should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity (including sunlight and daylight) to adjoining houses and their back gardens.
- 6.14 The mansard roof extension would not extend beyond the footprint of the existing roof and would not introduce windows any closer to neighbouring properties than existing windows on lower floors. Therefore, the insertion of two windows to the front and two to the rear roofslope of the mansard would not significantly increase overlooking to any of the surrounding dwellings.
- 6.15 There has been a complaint from occupants of a property across the street from the application site regarding loss of light, but given the distances involved (18m), this is unlikely to be a significant issue resulting from the construction of a mansard.
- 6.16 It is therefore considered that the proposed mansard would not increase any loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy for the neighbouring properties. There would be no noise impact from the extension as its proposed use is domestic.
- 6.17 Therefore, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

Issues raised by consultation

- 6.18 Issues with trees that are not within the application property and which are not part of this application cannot be considered as part of it. Property values, too, are not planning considerations.

Equalities Considerations

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

Further information and resources are available at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

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

Conclusion

- 7.0 The Local Planning Authority has considered the particular circumstances of the application against relevant planning policy set out in the Development Management Local Plan (2014), the Core Strategy (2011), London Plan (March 2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

- 8.0 The Council does not support mansards where they would have a detrimental impact upon the streetscape and therefore planning permission should be refused.

- 8.0 RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reasons:**

The proposed mansard roof extension, by reason of its height above the parapet and existing roof, brick side walls and effective creation of an additional floor to this 2 storey property would be an incongruous, unsympathetic and visually intrusive addition harmful to the historic design conventions of the host property and the character and appearance of the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 7.4 Local character, 7.6 Architecture and 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology of the London Plan (March 2016), Policies 15 High quality design for Lewisham and 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policies 30 Urban design and local character, 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and 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 of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) and paragraph 6.7 of the Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).

The proposed mansard roof extension would result in the loss of the historic roof form to the detriment of the character of the host property, the historic and cohesive nature of the immediate terrace of which it forms part, St Johns Vale and the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. As such it would be contrary to Policies 7.4 Local character, 7.6 Architecture and 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology of the London Plan (March 2016), Policies 15 High quality design for Lewisham and 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policies 30 Urban design and local character, 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and 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 of the Development Management

Local Plan (November 2014) and paragraph 6.7 of the Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).

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, no pre-application advice was sought before the application was submitted. Although further discussions have taken place regarding the application, the proposal was clearly contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan.