



Planning Committee A

Report title:

46 JERNINGHAM ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5NW

Date: 20 October 2022

Key decision: No.

Class: Part 1

Ward(s) affected: Telegraph Hill

Contributors: Thomas Simnett

Outline and recommendations

This report sets out the Officer's recommendation of approval for the below proposal subject to the conditions and informatives.

This report has been brought before Committee for a decision due to the submission of ten objections from local residents and one objection from the Telegraph Hill Society.

Application details

Application reference number:	DC/22/125363
Application Date:	05 February 2022
Applicant:	Charlotte Tate of Icen Projects acting on behalf of Mr Gillam
Proposal:	The construction of two storey plus basement side extension at 46 Jerningham Road SE14, together with associated alterations to side boundary wall.
Background Papers:	(1) Submission Drawings (2) Submission technical reports and supporting documents (3) Internal consultee responses
Designation:	PTAL 6a Air Quality Telegraph Hill Article 4(2) Direction Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Not a Listed Building
Screening:	Not applicable.

1 SITE AND CONTEXT

Site description and current use

- 1 The application site is occupied by one of the pair of semi-detached three storey properties, located on the south western side of Jerningham road in a predominately residential area.
- 2 The site also includes land to the side which is predominately used for off-street parking with access gained by a dropped curb on Ommaney Road and as an additional patio area.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



Figure 1 – Site location plan

Heritage/archaeology

- 3 The site is located within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area and is subject to the Article 4 Direction, but it is not a listed building or in the vicinity of one.
- 4 It is within Telegraph Hill Conservation Area, character area 1, comprised of the original Haberdashers Estate development characterised by strong uniformity of design, a restricted materials palette and a high level of architectural detailing. The front gardens provide a verdant setting to the setting of the houses. No. 46 is identified in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area; hence it is considered to be a Non-Designated Heritage Asset.

Surrounding area

- 5 The surrounding area is predominately residential in nature and is comprised of a mix of buildings which were built around the 19th and 20th Centuries, all of distinctive style and form.

Transport

- 6 The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a, where on a scale of 1 to 6, 1 is the lowest and 6 is the highest.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

2 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

7 **DC/17/100404:** Front Garden: ONE lime Urgent request FELL following storm damage. **Raised no objection**

8 **DC/18/117330:** The replacement of the front path paving, of the front steps and of the railings to the front of 46 Jerningham Road, SE14, together with the replacement of the concrete wall and trellis with timber fencing to the north side boundary of the front garden and the installation of replacement gates fronting Ommaney Road. **Granted**

Pre-application advice

9 **PRE/20/119658:** Construction of three storey with basement residential extension to 46 Jerningham Road, London, SE14 5NW.

10 **PRE/21/121154:** Follow up to pre-application reference PRE/20/119658 for the construction of three storey with basement residential extension to 46 Jerningham Road, London, SE14 5NW.

- Pre-app advice advised that the proposed development must retain the existing symmetrical semi-detached nature; be subservient to the host dwelling; positively address Ommaney Road; respond to the predominantly pitched hipped roofs of the conservation area; position the extension so that the semi-detached form retains its predominance in some views; use brick as the principal material.

Enforcement History

11 **ENF/13/00477:** Alleged unauthorised construction in a Conservation Area of an outbuilding in the side garden of 46 Jerningham Road. **Enforcement notice service and complied with. Alleged breach was rectified.**

3 CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATION

3.1 THE PROPOSALS

12 This application relates to the construction of two storey plus basement side extension at 46 Jerningham Road SE14, together with associated alterations to side boundary wall.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



Figure 2 – CGI of the proposed development

- 13 The proposed work involves the construction of a new side extension comprising basement, ground and first floor levels as well as construction of a new level-access entrance to the ground floor from Ommaney Road.
- 14 The applicant in consultation with Conservation Officers have revised their scheme in a number of ways:
- Removal of fence between the host property and the side garden;
 - Amendments to the windows to better reflect the existing bay windows;
 - Roof overhang;
 - Increased soft landscaping;

3.1.1 PRE-APPLICATION VERSIONS

- 15 There had been two rounds of pre-application advice which has seen the design develop and become more refined which has less of an impact on the host property and wider conservation area.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



Figure 3 – pre-application proposal in 2020 and 2021 respectively, demonstrating how the design has evolved

16 Conservation Officers were involved in the meetings and their feedback has allowed the design to further evolve into the scheme that has been submitted with this application.

4 CONSULTATION

4.1 PRE-APPLICATION ENGAGEMENT

17 There was no pre-application engagement undertaken by the applicant with the general public.

4.2 APPLICATION PUBLICITY

18 Site notices were displayed on 01 March 2022 and a press notice was published on 23 February 2022.

19 Letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors on 16 February 2022.

20 11no responses received, comprising 10no objections and 1no objection from an amenity society.

4.2.1 Comments in objection

Comment	Para where addressed
Principle of Development	
Potential self-contained use of the extension in the future	Paras 38 and 39
Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets	
Proportions of the windows are not in keeping with host property	Para 59

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

The scale and bulk of the upper floor development is out of character to the conservation area	Para 60
Proposals design is out of keeping with the conservation area	Para 62
Loss of symmetry between No 46 and its adjoining neighbour, No 48	Para 63
Proposal for side extension is not in accordance with the Alterations and Extensions SPD guidance	Para 56
Choice of materials	Para 58
The appearance and design are inconsistent with the style and qualities of the conservation area.	Para 58
Extension is read as a separate house	Para 73
Natural Environment	
Astroturf on the roof of the basement extension	Paras 87 and 88
Loss of side garden for residential development	Para 83

4.2.2 Neutral comments

- 21 A number of neutral comments relating to non-material planning considerations were also raised as follows:
- 22 A number of comments were received which questioned the impact of the proposal on the structural integrity of the semi-detached pair, although the applicant submitted a structural report this is considered to be a Building Control issue and as such is not a planning consideration in this application.
- 23 A number of comments were received which objected to the proposal due to the impact it would have on neighbouring properties views. There is no right to a view or planning controls to safeguard a view for the continuing benefit of an existing landowner, Officers therefore do not consider the loss of or interruption of a view to be a material planning consideration.

4.2.3 Comments in Objection from Telegraph Hill Society

Comment	Para where addressed
Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets	
Not in keeping with the design of the area	Para 58
Conflicts with the SPD	Para 56
Impact on the symmetrical pair	Para 63
The proposals neither respects nor compliments the form, setting, period,	Para 60

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

architectural characters or detailing of the original property	
Proposed windows do not respond to the host property	Para 59
Incongruous addition	Para 58
Fails to repair the street frontage	Para 57
Loss of bay window	Para 66

4.3 LOCAL MEETING

24 Due to the number of submissions received, a virtual Local Meeting was held on Tuesday 27 September 2022. The meeting was chaired by Councillor Joan Millbank and attended by two people. Notes from the Local Meeting are contained in Appendix 1 of this report.

4.4 INTERNAL CONSULTATION

25 The following internal consultees were notified on 14 February 2022.

26 Highways: gave no comments.

27 Conservation: raised concerns with the proposal during the lifetime of the application and a meeting was held between the applicant and Conservation Officer on 30 May 2022 to discuss the application. Following the meeting between Officers and the agent a further set of revised drawings were submitted which Conservation considered addressed a large number of the comments which were raised. See Section 6.2 for further details.

5 POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 LEGISLATION

28 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (S38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 Town & Country Planning Act 1990).

29 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990: S.66/S.72 gives the LPA special duties in respect of heritage assets.

5.2 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

30 A material consideration is anything that, if taken into account, creates the real possibility that a decision-maker would reach a different conclusion to that which they would reach if they did not take it into account.

31 Whether or not a consideration is a relevant material consideration is a question of law for the courts. Decision-makers are under a duty to have regard to all applicable policy as a material consideration.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

32 The weight given to a relevant material consideration is a matter of planning judgement. Matters of planning judgement are within the exclusive province of the LPA. This report sets out the weight Officers have given relevant material considerations in making their recommendation to Members. Members, as the decision-makers, are free to use their planning judgement to attribute their own weight, subject to aforementioned directions and the test of reasonableness.

5.3 NATIONAL POLICY & GUIDANCE

- National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance 2014 onwards (NPPG)
- National Design Guidance 2019 (NDG)

5.4 DEVELOPMENT PLAN

33 The Development Plan comprises:

- London Plan (March 2021) (LPP)
- Core Strategy (June 2011) (CSP)
- Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) (DMP)
- Site Allocations Local Plan (June 2013) (SALP)
- Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan (February 2014) (LTCP)

5.5 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

34 Lewisham SPD:

- Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2019)

35 London Plan SPG/SPD:

- Character and Context (June 2014)

5.6 OTHER MATERIAL DOCUMENTS

- Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal

6 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

36 The main issues are:

- Principle of Development;
- Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets;
- Impact on Adjoining Properties;
- Natural Environment

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

6.1 PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

General policy

- 37 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 11, states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that proposals should be approved without delay so long as they accord with the development plan.

Discussion

- 38 Comments were received that were concerned with the proposed extension becoming self-contained accommodation in the future. While Officers acknowledge that the proposed side extension is on the larger size and has an internal floor space of circa 155sqm, the submitted plans do not indicate it could be easily separated from the host property. The main living facilities in terms of kitchen and bathrooms are all contained in the host property, and not the extension.
- 39 Decision-makers can only assess an application based on the submitted plans and the permission to which the applicant is seeking. As such Officers have assessed this application as a side extension and are not concerned that it could easily be turned into separate self-contained accommodation, planning permission would be required if the applicant sought to do this in the future.
- 40 The development plan is generally supportive of people extending or altering their homes. As such, the principle of development is supported subject to an assessment of the details.

6.2 URBAN DESIGN AND IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSET

General Policy

- 41 The NPPF at para 126 states the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
- 42 Heritage assets may be designated—including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, archaeological remains—or non-designated.
- 43 Section 72 of the of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 gives LPAs the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.
- 44 Relevant paragraphs of Chapter 16 of the NPPF set out how LPAs should approach determining applications that relate to heritage assets. This includes giving great weight to the asset's conservation, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset. Further, that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Policy

- 45 London Plan Policy D3 states that development proposals should respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features and characteristics

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

that are unique to the locality and respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute towards the local character. It should also be of high quality, with architecture that pays attention to detail, and gives thorough consideration to the practicality of use, flexibility, safety and building lifespan through appropriate construction methods and the use of attractive, robust materials which weather and mature well.

- 46 London Plan Policy HC1 states that proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.
- 47 Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham repeats the necessity to achieve high quality design but also confirms a requirement for new developments to minimise crime and the fear of crime.
- 48 CSP 16 ensures the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets are among things enhanced and conserved in line with national and regional policy.
- 49 DMLP 30 - Urban design and local character states that all new developments should provide a high standard of design and should respect the existing forms of development in the vicinity. The London Plan, Lewisham Core Strategy and Lewisham DMLP policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality urban design. DM Policy 33 seek to protect and enhance the Borough's character and street frontages through appropriate and high-quality design.
- 50 DMP 36 echoes national and regional policy and summarises the steps the borough will take to manage changes to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens so that their value and significance as designated heritage assets is maintained and enhanced.
- 51 DMP 37 sets out a framework for the protection of the borough's non-designated heritage assets.
- 52 Further guidance is given in Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

Discussion

- 53 The proposed extension has three levels – basement, ground (which corresponds with the lower ground floor of the host building) and first (which corresponds with the raised ground floor of the host building). Officers consider the basement would not have a visual presence from the streetscene given the existing boundary treatments. The (lower) ground floor will be set beneath the existing garden level at the front and open out onto the garden level at the rear. The first floor will sit above the garden level to front and rear and be the level that is principally visible from the street.
- 54 The applicant had undergone two rounds of pre-application advice with Officers and Conservation Officers prior to the submission of this application. Officers consider that the proposal has responded positively to the pre-app advice given; the footprint is set back from the front building line and springs from the front edge of the chimney stack; it sits one storey below eaves level and so appears subordinate to the building. Its

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

orientation addresses Ommaney Road, and visually demarcates it as a contemporary addition. Its set back building line allows the envelope of the semi-detached pair to still be read in views from the south, until one gets closer to the junction with Ommaney Road.

- 55 The extent of garden space between no. 46 and the site boundary fronting Ommaney Road, due to the corner nature of the site, creates greater opportunity for side extensions than elsewhere in the Conservation Area where most of the buildings are more closely spaced.
- 56 Whilst the proposal is not in strict accordance with the Alterations and Extensions SPD conservation area guidance for side extensions, Officers would draw attention to Section 1.3.3 which states that “the guidance addresses many types of houses, roofs and buildings. However, there will always be schemes which fall outside the context of this document. In those instances, a reasonable and pragmatic approach will be taken. The Council is supportive of innovative and creative solutions that demonstrate the necessary high quality of design and detailing.” It is also worthy to note the purpose of the SPD is to encourage high quality design, which given the site context the proposed side extension does achieve. Officers are satisfied that while the proposal may not be in strict accordance with the guidance of Section 4.4.7, it is broadly speaking in accordance with the overall aims of the SPD to produce innovative and creative solutions and a high quality design.
- 57 Comments were received from Telegraph Hill Society that the proposal would fail to repair the street frontage as required by DMP 33, however Officers note that this is for a side extension and not a new dwelling and would be built set back from the Ommaney Road. As such Officers consider the proposal to be acceptable.
- 58 Officers consider that the nature of the Conservation Area would not be detrimentally impacted by these proposals. The applicant has made considerable efforts to ensure that the proposed extension will enhance the architectural character of the area, by adopting a sharp, contemporary language, which will complement the host building and contribute to the ongoing architectural richness of the area.
- 59 Comments were received regarding the proposed windows to the front elevation which were not in keeping with the host property, these comments were also shared by the Council’s Conservation Officer who advised the applicant to group them more closely, leaving a wider area of brickwork either side to better reflect the bay windows of the host property. The agents revised this element of the proposed design following feedback and Conservation Officers are satisfied with these design revisions.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



Figure 4 – amended window formation

- 60 Objections were also received that the scale and bulk of the upper floor extension is out of character to the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area, the proposals have significantly changed since 2020 pre-application meeting as shown in Figure 3. Officers consider that the main bulk of the extension is on the lower ground floor level, which is not visible from the street scene, the proposed upper ground floor extension is considered to be subservient to the host property.



Figure 5 – views of the extension from the street scene

- 61 Multiple objections were received that the proposed design, style of windows and design detailing is out of character with the wider conservation area. There were concerns that the contemporary design would give rise to harm and damage the special qualities of this conservation area.
- 62 Officers note the objections above and have considered them in detail. The proposals would introduce visible change in this location, but are not considered to result in material harm to the host property or conservation area. The design of the extensions is contemporary, and it is felt that the style, scale and materials would complement the application property and wider street scene well. The materials proposed are deemed to be of a high quality and a condition will secure further details of them and architectural

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

details of the window reveals, eaves junction and the junction between the extension and host property.

- 63 While it is recognised that the proposal would lead to a loss of symmetry to a small degree, the proposals design evolved from the pre-application stage to a design which respects the host property to a higher degree and has less of an impact on the symmetry of the pair. Conservation Officers consider the proposed design to be acceptable and would not lead to a degree of harm. The envelope of the semi-detached pair can still be read in views from the south, until one gets closer to the junction with Ommaney Road.
- 64 Conservation Officers had previously raised concerns with the lack of eaves overhand and gutters which were considered to be out of keeping with the host property, as a consequence amendments were submitted which amended the roof form and gutter to better reflect the host property.
- 65 The proposal also includes the removal of the off-street car-parking, which was accessed from Ommaney Road, Officers consider this would have a positive impact on the conservation area given the known impacts that off-street parking has on Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. A condition requiring the highway works to be agreed with the Council to restore the pavement and remove the crossover shall be imposed.
- 66 The Telegraph Hill Society have objected to the loss of the rear bay window as part of the proposed development. The bay is a traditional feature on some Victorian housing in the Conservation Area and is an integral part of the character of this type of housing. However, it is set to the rear on a less visible elevation where views are restricted to the upper floors of the surrounding houses. Therefore, while the removal would result in the loss of a historic feature of a degree of architectural interest, the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be negligible given the minimal visibility. As such, no harm to the Conservation Area is identified.
- 67 As mentioned in para 4, the property is identified as an NDHA i.e., the host property makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. NPPF para 203 requires that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The effect of this proposal would be to erode the NDHAs architectural integrity somewhat and that of the group of semi-detached pairs within which it falls. In this case the significance of the NDHA is moderate (being a NDHA that makes a positive contribution to a CA, within a consistent group of NDHAS) and the scale of harm or loss is at the low end of less than substantial, affecting the NDHA in a minimally visible location. As such, the impact of the proposal on the NDHA is also considered acceptable.
- 68 The proposed basement extension would be accessed from the upper ground floor of the new side extension and would provide additional space which will be used as wine store, shower room, utility room and games room/gym. None of the proposed rooms are intended to be used as primary living accommodation.
- 69 The proposed basement would be formed by excavating under the proposed footprint of the side extension. It would cover the full area of the side extension with a width of 7.3m and have a depth of 10m and have floor to ceiling height of 2.4m at the front part of the basement and 2.7m to the rear part. The proposed basement that extends out from the side elevation would form the basement to the two-storey rear extension which is also

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

proposed in this application. Officers consider the depth and width of the basement to be acceptable.

- 70 While Officers recognise that the proposed basement would be reliant upon artificial lighting and ventilation due to the lack of any natural lighting and ventilation from a lightwell, given the basements use would not be for primary habitable accommodation this is acceptable. The proposed uses as outlined in para 68 are uses that are unlikely to need natural daylight, as such Officers raise no concerns with the lack of natural day light to these rooms.
- 71 A condition will also be added for details of a ventilation strategy for the proposed basement given the lack of details which have been submitted with this application.
- 72 In light of the above, Officers are satisfied that the proposed basement extension would be used as additional space ancillary to the use of a single-family dwelling and subject to condition would be appropriately ventilated. As such, the proposal is not considered to cause harm to the host building, streetscape character or surrounding conservation area, and future amenity of users is appropriately provided for.
- 73 Concerns were originally raised by Conservation Officers with the provision of a timber fence above the existing boundary wall fronting Ommaney Road, these have since been removed and the wall/fence on Ommaney Road will remain as existing. Amendments were also submitted to the boundary between the existing dwelling and the proposed extension, this had originally included a fence which gave the illusion of two separate dwellings. However, following negotiation with the applicant this have been revised to include soft landscaping/hedge to provide a natural barrier to the two different levels.

6.2.1 Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets Conclusion

- 74 Officers consider that the proposed design of the side extension to be of a high quality and would complement the host property's traditional design and successfully demarcates it visually as a contemporary addition.
- 75 Officers, having regard to the statutory duties in respect of Conservation Areas in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the relevant paragraphs in the NPPF in relation to conserving the historic environment, are satisfied the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of Telegraph Hill Conservation Area.
- 76 The proposed revisions have addressed a large number of the comments Conservation Officers raised previously, as a result Officers consider that the proposal as a whole will now relate sensitively to the host building and will read as a high quality contemporary addition to the host building, that will preserve both the setting of the non-designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area.

6.3 IMPACT ON ADJOINING NEIGHBOURS

General Policy

- 77 NPPF para 127 sets an expectation that new development will be designed to create places that amongst other things have a 'high standard' of amenity for existing and future users. At para 180 it states decisions should ensure that new development is

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health and living conditions.

- 78 This is reflected in relevant policies of the London Plan (LPP D3), the Core Strategy (CP15), the Local Plan (DMP32).

Discussion

- 79 Due to siting of the proposed extension and the separation distance to properties adjoining to the rear, there would be no adverse impact on neighbour amenity from the two-storey plus basement level extension as no windows would be located on the side elevation of the property and the height and setback of the proposed extensions mean that they would not appear overbearing from adjoining properties.

6.3.1 Impact on Adjoining Neighbours Conclusion

- 80 Officers consider due to its siting the extension would not have an unacceptable impact on adjoining neighbours.

6.4 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Policy

- 81 S.197 of the Town and Country Planning Act gives LPAs specific duties in respect of trees. Para 131 of the NPPF seeks to retain trees wherever possible. Para 174 expects development to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.
- 82 CSP 12 and DMP 25 seeks to improve the urban greening of London and encourages proposals to include the use of living roofs on flat roofs.

Discussion

- 83 While the loss of the side garden is unfortunate, the existing situation did not contribute greatly in terms of biodiversity and planting as the area was predominately hard standing; a driveway that provided parking for at least two cars and a large proportion of the side garden was designated as a patio. The proposals would feature increased soft planting areas and a deeper substrate biodiverse living roof. It should be noted that the large existing rear garden remains unchanged, and the proposed development would occupy less than 50% of the garden space.
- 84 The proposal includes an area to the front of the side extension which would contain hard and soft landscaping, however comments received from the Council's Conservation Officer considered this planting area to be insufficient.
- 85 During the course of the application revisions were received which increased the depth of the proposed soft landscaping to maximise this area and avoid the front being overly hard landscaped. While the hard landscaping is still on the larger side, Officers consider it appropriate to compare this in comparison to the existing area of patio which is located where the extension would be constructed. In light of this Officers consider it to be an acceptable size, and a soft landscaping condition will be imposed to secure it given how it helps to soften the developments impact.
- 86 Officers note that a tree was felled from the boundary of No. 46 in 2017 due to health and safety concerns following a storm, the proposal indicates at least four trees would be

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

planted along the front boundary of Jerningham Road at basement level. This would also help to screen the extension to a certain degree, limiting its impact on the street scene.

- 87 Comments were received that characterised this biodiverse living roof as Astro turf, Astroturf is not an appropriate material and would not be acceptable had the roof been covered with it, which is not the case.



Figure 6 - Visualisation of the proposed front garden courtyard, with level access to Ommaney Road

- 88 The roof of the lower ground floor extension would feature a biodiverse living roof, which have a deeper substrate in order to sustain more substantial planting on the roof. The biodiverse living roof would have biodiversity and heritage impacts, given it too would help to soften the impact of the proposal. A planning condition securing details of the biodiverse living roof with a substrate membrane of 150 mm will be imposed to ensure the benefits of the living roof are materialised.

6.4.1 Natural Environment Conclusion

- 89 Officers consider the proposals would help to improve biodiversity of the site and increased number of trees would help with meeting London's target of increasing the tree coverage by 10%.

7 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

- 90 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- 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
- sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

91 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.

92 The CIL is not liable and is therefore not a material consideration.

8 EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

93 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.

94 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

95 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.

96 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: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/technical-guidance-public-sector-equality-duty-england>

97 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
- Engagement and the equality duty

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- Equality objectives and the equality duty
- Equality information and the equality duty

98 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: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty-guidance>

99 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.

9 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

100 In determining this application, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 prohibits authorities (including the Council as local planning authority) from acting in a way which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. "Convention" here means the European Convention on Human Rights, certain parts of which were incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998. Various Convention rights are likely to be relevant including:

- Article 8: Respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence
- Protocol 1, Article 1: Right to peaceful enjoyment of your property

101 This report has outlined the consultation that has been undertaken on the planning application and the opportunities for people to make representations to the Council as Local Planning Authority.

102 Members need to satisfy themselves that the potential adverse amenity impacts are acceptable and that any potential interference with the above Convention Rights will be legitimate and justified. Both public and private interests are to be taken into account in the exercise of the Local Planning Authority's powers and duties. Any interference with a Convention right must be necessary and proportionate. Members must, therefore, carefully consider the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest.

103 This application has the legitimate aim of improving the thermal efficiency of the application property. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including Article 8 and Protocol 1 Article 1 are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

10 CONCLUSION

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

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

105 The proposed development would relate sensitively to the host property and Officers consider it would be read as a high quality contemporary addition to the host building, which would not cause any harm to the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. The provision of biodiverse green roofs would help to improve the biodiversity onsite and provide a natural buffer to the extension which would be read as a single storey extension from the streetscene.

11 RECOMMENDATION

106 That the Committee resolve to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions and informatives:

11.1 CONDITIONS

1) FULL PLANNING PERMISSION TIME LIMIT

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) APPROVED PLANS

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

057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-00000; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-00001; 057-TWA-XX-00-DR-AX-01000; 057-TWA-XX-01-DR-AX-01001; 057-TWA-XX-02-DR-AX-01002; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-07001; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-07002; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-07003; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-06001; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-06002; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-06003; Heritage Statement (Iceni Projects, February 2022); Structural Report ref no. PB-2307-BIA-01 (Parmar Brook) (Received 08 February 2022)

057-TWA-XX-B1-DR-AX-11009; 057-TWA-XX-00-DR-AX-11000 REV 01; 057-TWA-XX-01-DR-AX-11001 REV 01; 057-TWA-XX-02-DR-AX-11002; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-16001; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-16002 REV 01; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-16003 REV 01; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-17001 REV 01; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-17002 REV 01; 057-TWA-XX-XX-DR-AX-17003 REV 01; Design and Access Statement rev 08 (Anomaly, 02 August 2022) (Received 03 August 2022)

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) SOFT LANDSCAPING

(a) A scheme of soft landscaping (including details of any trees or hedges to be retained and proposed plant numbers, species, location and size of trees and tree pits) and details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years shall be submitted to and approved in

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works.

- (b) All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme under part (a). Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with Core Strategy Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 25 Landscaping and trees and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

4) HARD LANDSCAPING

- (a) Prior to superstructure works drawings showing hard landscaping of any part of the site not occupied by buildings (including details of the permeability of hard surfaces) shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (b) All hard landscaping works which form part of the approved scheme under part (a) shall be completed prior to occupation of the development.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with Policies SI 12 Flood risk management in the London Plan (March 2021), Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) Policy 25 Landscaping and trees, and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

5) BOUNDARY TREATMENTS

- (a) Details of the proposed boundary treatments including any gates, walls or fences shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works.
- (b) The approved boundary treatments shall be implemented prior to occupation of the buildings and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the boundary treatment is of adequate design in the interests of visual and residential amenity and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

6) MATERIALS

No development above ground shall commence on site until a detailed schedule, specification and sample panel of all external materials and finishes, windows and external doors and roof coverings to be used on the extension have been

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

7) LIVING ROOFS

- (a) Prior to the above ground works, details of the hereby approved a biodiverse living roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority 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 Policy G5 Urban greening in the London Plan (2021), 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).

8) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS

- (a) Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, no development above ground level shall commence for any phase of the development until detailed plans at a scale of 1:5 showing window and door reveals, eaves junction and junction between the host property and hereby approved side extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority
- (b) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the detailed treatment of the proposal 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.

9) DETAILS OF BASEMENT VENTILATION

- (a) Prior to the above ground works, details of the ventilation system to be provided to the basement rooms shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (b) The ventilation system shall be installed in accordance with the approved plans and specification before use of the development hereby permitted first

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

commences and shall thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved specification.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied that the development is not going to result in a poor standard of accommodation to existing and future residents from a lack of natural ventilation to the hereby approved basement rooms and to comply with Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards.

11.2 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.
- 2) Biodiverse living roof systems should use a low nutrient substrate base and should vary to make a mosaic of different substrate depths between 80-170mm with peaks and troughs (but averaging at least 133mm). Seeded and plug planted with native wildflower species that includes other materials to vary the micro-habitat/topography characteristics of the locality in which the roof is situated e.g., larger boulders/rocks, mounds of sand for solitary bees/wasps and/or one natural hardwood per 20m² for other invertebrates: suggested dimensions +100mm diameter +1m long.
- 3) The applicant is advised that the brickwork should be Flemish bond for the hereby approved extension.

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- (1) Submission Drawings
- (2) Submission technical reports and supporting documents
- (3) Internal consultee responses

13 REPORT AUTHOR AND CONTACT

Thomas Simnett – thomas.simnett@lewisham.gov.uk - 020 8314 6284

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

Appendix 1 – Local Meeting Minutes

46 Jerningham Road

DC/22/125363

Introductions

The virtual local meeting started at 7pm and was hosted by the council. Representing Council were Thomas Simnett (Case Officer) and Cllr Joan Millbank chaired the meeting. Cllr Joan Millbank introduced the local meeting and case officer gave introduction on the purpose of the local meeting. Three local residents were present at the meeting along with the agent and architect of the scheme.

The applicant's team introduced themselves as Charlotte Tate and Lewis Westhoff of Icen Projects and Petr Esposito from Anomaly.

The agent's team provided a presentation which covered the scheme and some of the questions which have been submitted before the meeting. Discussion comprised of the site context and views of Jerningham Road, and how various massing was explored in the design scheme which reduced the scheme to a more-low key one.

Discussion moved onto the existing site coverage with the side garden used as a driveway and patio garden area. The aim is to add further soft landscaping as part of these proposals. The existing building's flank wall does not provide much in terms of design, the design concept has been developed to provide a larger lower ground floor extension and a smaller additional storey above this. This will help to ensure that from the streetscape it would only be seen as a single storey extension in views from Jerningham Road. The proportions reflect of the existing dwelling in terms of windows etc, the extension is provided at an angle to the host property to ensure key views are maintained and that it does not impact on those views considered important by conservation officers.

Key thing is to make sure it is context appropriate, the proportions of the host bay have been copied over to the extension to make sure it reflects the host. It is intentional that it is not a replica of the host property to ensure it is distinguished as a modern addition. The brick detailing will be to match the existing Flemish bond.

These are the ways which we have responded to comments by conservation officers: ensure lower ground floor context sits behind the boundary treatment, we have add a number of green features of soften the impact, the proportions are in keeping with the host property as asked for by conservation officers, glass connection detail to make an obvious separation, materials will reflect context.

Questions submitted prior to the meeting were the following: **(Agent answers in bold)**

1. The Conservation Officer made the following comments as regards the application. Can the applicant explain how they have each been addressed, highlighting those which have not been addressed:
 - a. Building right out to the side boundary will result in reduced scope for planting along this boundary, to the detriment of the street scene. A green roof is welcomed but can larger scale planting be accommodated along the side boundary? This would require a deeper planting substrate and possibly loss of floor-ceiling height at this side of the (lower) ground floor.

We've actually added a lot of planting around the buildings, including substantial greenery around it including intensive biodiverse living roofs and several new trees. The initial planning proposal had a larger hard landscaping area, this was reduced after conservation officers comments

- b. Fence on top of wall – where this wall is screening the (lower) ground floor structure it would be preferable if it read honestly, ie as a brick flank elevation. **This has been reduced so more of the masonry can be seen, I think this is key when you see this from the long elevation. Where it remains this is existing fence, where it has been taken away additional soft landscaping has been added. A much improved elevation.**
- c. Is the boundary wall being demolished and rebuilt? This should be clearly shown on the plans. If so, existing brickwork should be re-used. **The boundary wall is not being demolished, it will be repaired where required. Where new access is to be provided these bricks will be re-used to infill the current driveway access. We will use reclaimed brick to match the existing wall.**
- d. The large lightwell in the front garden is not in keeping with the prevailing character. It will be minimally visible other than across the front garden of the host building because of the height of the boundary wall at this corner. However the loss of planting space will have a visual impact on the CA as a result of loss of existing and potential front garden soft landscaping and will erode the garden setting of the host property. **This has been revised and made a lot smaller, we have looked at other properties along Jerningham Road to ensure it is within context. It should be noted that the levels are not changing and the proposal would be at the same level as at the moment and the area in front of the extension will not be further excavated.**
- e. I advise that the lightwell should be reduced to a minimum and the majority of the garden should be retained to allow planting to contribute to street scene and prevent an incongruous view across the host building's front garden or over the boundary wall **We believe the proposed revisions strikes a correct balance between hard and soft landscaping in context to the existing. The public realm improvements will be significant.**
- f. A significantly smaller lightwell would be more responsive to the local context and the prevailing form of lower ground floor openings should be the cue for this elevation. **The lightwell aligns with the existing frontage of No 46 Jerningham Road, we have added more greening**
- g. Removal of the fence between the main house front garden and the extension would help to unify the garden setting and prevent the extension appearing as a separate dwelling. This will make the (lower) ground floor elevation more visible so the points above will need to be addressed. **We have removed the fence between the two, we have now introduced a wall and some soft landscaping to prevent falling. We have developed the design so you see a better relationship between the two.**
- h. A large tree in the front garden was felled a few years ago and new planting has been provided. A proposal to retain/re-site the existing trees would be welcomed. **While we cannot put back a large tree, we are introducing new trees which can mature into a large tree in the future.**
- i. (Lower) ground floor elevations- Front – not in keeping with the character of the CA, which is of small punched openings in brick or rendered elevations, clearly subordinate to the elevations above. The dominant door opening

appears too large for a secondary entrance. The wide opening doesn't respond to the scale or character of lower ground floor openings in the CA. **Again compared to the original submitted design we have developed this in consideration of comments to have piers which better reflect the host property.**

- j. The three windows refer to the tripartite bay on the host building, but my opinion is that this might be more successful if they were grouped more closely, leaving a wider area of brickwork either side. This may also be preferable for the blind windows on the northern, (flank) elevation.

Again we have worked to ensure we get this right, this was developed so the repetition is now accurate. Context driven.

- k. The brick detailing is not wholly successful in responding to the CA context, nor is the asymmetrical fenestration detailing. I consider that the detailing needs more consideration to help preserve the existing character and appearance.

detailing will match the existing

- l. Roofscape – Whilst clay tile and the pitch are a positive response to the roofscape of the CA, the lack of eaves overhang and gutters looks out of keeping.

While originally there were no gutters at the front we haven't listened to feedback and introduced gutters to the front and a slight overhanging eaves to reflect the existing

- 2. Whilst some improvements have been made, the design is still out of keeping with the Conservation Area. Can the applicant please explain, with regard to each element separately, (a) why they feel the element is necessary (b) , if necessary, why it cannot be designed in a manner which reflects the appearance of the original building and (c) given that DM36.4 a requires that the Council should refuse applications where the new development is incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its plot coverage, scale, form and materials, why the applicant thinks that the element of the application makes it compatible with the Conservation Area:

- a. Soldier course brickwork, which is never used in these properties, which is not an adequate response to proper lintels, cills and eaves of the original **We will make this to match existing detailing**
- b. Where lintels have been provided, these are plain square blocks, not in keeping with the rest of the property.
- c. Large basement bi-fold windows and plate glass doors doors in the front elevation including a large front basement front access.
- d. Blank side windows, again with soldier course brickwork and elements of vertically placed stretcher brickwork where the blank windows are (this type of brickwork is not Victorian, although something like diaperwork might be) **We have replicated the detailing over the blank side windows to reflect the front windows proposed, which also reflect the existing bay window proportions.**
- e. Green roof over the basement extension **Having a green roof is a good bit of biodiversity which softens the massing and addresses some of the issues over the previous proposal.**
- f. Raised wall and fencing on the north elevation which obscures the rear of the property (please reference the Conservation Area Appraisal which states that the views of the rear of the property as are important and uniform as the fronts)

This was covered in the previous.

- g. First floor window in the rear elevation (clearly visible from the public realm even with the raised fence) which does not replicate or harmonise in style with the existing rear windows either the main building or its outrigger
We have looked at something that is contemporary and cannot be seen from street level, this evidenced in some of the key views.
- h. Plate glass, bifold windows in the rear extension both on the north side and west sides and soldier course brickwork in the west elevation extension
Where views cannot be seen from the street level, we have sought for a more modern contemporary style.
- i. The removal of the bay window in the rear elevation (which would be very visible from the public realm if the fence was not raised and the top of which still will be) and its replacement by a square opening with a large plate glass window, and vertical stretcher brick surround.

In answering this question the applicant should note that other applicant in the area have successfully replicated original windows and doors (using conservatory type doors with wooden risers where appropriate and wooden glazing bars) including lintels and cills, used correct brick bonding, and replaced or re-built original bay windows. In some instances, whole properties have been built which faithfully match the existing designs and are indistinguishable from them.

- 3. The drawings show the works being carried out in stretcher bond. Can the applicant confirm that, should the application be approved, it is intended to use Flemish bond in order to match the existing property? If not, would the planning officer confirm that it will be made a condition, should approval be given for the development?
We are happy to use Flemish bond.
- 4. What justification, from the point of view of preserving the appearance of the Conservation Area, is there for building the extension at an angle to the main property where there are no precedents for doing so elsewhere in the Conservation Area? The angle, as shown in the proposed north elevation makes an uncomfortable join to the existing building. Any Victorian extension would have been built parallel to the existing frontage.
We had a number of designs that had a straight angle, but if we had done this it would have been more prominent and had a more bearing impact on the view down Jerningham road. The proposal is context driven to ensure it limits the view from down Jerningham Road, it allows it to become more subservient.
- 5. We will see the rear of this property from our flat and the modern alterations which don't fit in with the area - particularly the rear bay will be visible to us and our neighbours and the public, including the destruction of the original bay window. Can the applicant please explain why the proposed works to the rear elevation of the outrigger and the erection of fences and walls at an increased height are necessary, and particularly why the original bay window has to be removed and replaced with a plate glass design in modern style which has no relationship to the original design of the property? This ruins the view of the rear of the properties and destroys the architectural integrity of the area.
To reinforce earlier points in terms of the conservation area impacts, where we feel views are mitigated and have minimal public interest we are not looking to make as many changes. The most significant changes we have done is to the front.

6. Development management policy 31.3 states that applications 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 the terms of the important features of the area. The row of properties of which this forms part are of a uniform design. The extension does not match this design (which the applicant acknowledges by the need to hide certain elements behind high walls) and therefore will adversely affect the integrity of the Conservation Area. Does the applicant agree? If not, why not?
By virtue of design, we have highlighted the subservience of the design. This is a unique building, and there are key architectural moves that means that it is the dominant architectural element. The lower ground floor massing sits below the envelop of the site, what can be seen from the street has been greatly reduced, and the angle of the extension has been dictated to by the views down Jerningham Road and the materials have been context driven. The styling is also context driven and not pastiche of the existing property.
7. Why has the applicant not considered replacement of the uPVC windows in the remainder of the property with replacement sash windows as part of this application? Has the Council encouraged the applicant so to do (as required by DM 36.5 (“ The Council will encourage the reinstatement or require the retention of architectural and landscaping features ... important to an area's character or appearance”) ? If not, why not? If so, what is the reason the applicant has given for refusal?
The existing uPVC is double glazed and we are not seeking to change these if we do not have to, this is a sustainability point.
Case officer: the council has various mechanisms in place to encourage the reinstatement of original features, one such example is the use of Article 4 Directions in the borough. It is also important to realise that we have to assess the application that is in front of us, while we can encourage we cannot make applicants reinstate.
8. Does the applicant not feel that there is some onus on those living in a Conservation Area to preserve the Conservation Area (the uniformity of the Conservation Area being one of the reasons it was made a Conservation Area in the first place)?
Our view is that we are looking to enhance the corner position by adding further greening and trees, which will fix and improve the brick envelope, overall we are seeking to achieve this.
9. There is some evidence of subsidence on the site. Given the amount of excavation work being proposed has the applicant carried out a structural survey of the existing property to ensure that there is no likelihood of damage to the original building or to the adjoining property?
Although not a material planning consideration, we have undertaken a structural survey even though this is not a validation requirement. We have made sure there will be no harm to the host buildings or surrounding buildings.
10. There have been some wonderful extensions and new builds in our area that so faithfully copy the original Victorian design and in such modest dimensions that it is difficult to see where the new and the old join. (This is not one of them.) This proposed development would occupy a significant proportion (around 50%) of the original garden of the property. Green roofs do not provide the same biodiversity that is provided by a garden. Does the applicant not believe that, given the global climate crisis, that there is an imperative to retain garden space rather than build upon it?

To reaffirm we are not looking to make a pastiche of the original building. In terms of the garden, the original side garden already has a large amount of hard standing and a drive way, we are looking to improve this and this will create more soft landscaping. In terms of green roof this will not be a sedum roof but will be an intensive biodiverse roof as required by condition, which I believe does encourage biodiversity.

11. The Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal specifically highlights the view Jerningham Road; in view of this, why is it felt appropriate to add an element into that view which is so conspicuously different from the design of existing houses?
No we have answered this already.
12. What is the proposed public good (as opposed to private good to the applicant) that offsets the clear damage that is being done to the rear of the property by the demolition of the bay the change to the uniformity of street scape in general?
No we have answered this already.
13. The proposed additions include a significant amount of large plate glass windows at ground level. Given the increasing concern about the effects of light pollution on the urban environment, on neighbours and on nature, should the applicant not consider reducing amount of plate glass used in the development, and, if not, what is the applicant intending to do to ensure the impact of the considerable extra light pollution is minimised?
We have amended the design, the large plate glass at the front have been revised and reduced. We're hopeful this is more befitting of the host building
14. Why the architect they think it is pastiche to replicate the Victorian elements that we who live here love about this area?
The key thing is that modern building techniques are different now, to replicate that here would not be fitting to a contemporary modern building standard, therefore by not replicating celebrates the existing building by not trying to mimic and copy it. It further celebrates what you have as a key asset, by not trying to diminish that by doing a copy of it. This tries to sympathise and celebrate the existing building and give a nod to it, without trying to fake it.