

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	96 ERLANGER ROAD, SE14 5TH	
Ward	Telegraph Hill	
Contributors	Louise Holland	
Class	PART 1	24 MAY 2012

Reg. No. DC/11/78042

Application dated 03/08/11 revised 06/02/12

Mr J Hallett

Proposal The installation of roof lights in the front and rear roof slopes at 96 Erlanger Road SE14, together with alterations to the rear at lower ground level.

Applicant's Plan Nos. 121(PP)001 Rev B, Site Location Plan, Rooflight Specification and Design & Access Statement

Background Papers

- (1) Case File DE/47/96/TP
- (2) Adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)
- (3) Local Development Framework Documents
- (4) The London Plan (July 2011)

Designation Telegraph Hill Conservation Area  
Telegraph Hill Article 4(2) Direction

## **1.0 Property/Site Description**

1.1 The subject property is a two storey mid-terrace Victorian dwelling house, situated on the west side of Erlanger Road within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area, which is subject to an Article 4 Direction. The property has a three storey original rear addition.

1.2 Erlanger Road is largely made up of two storey, and two storey and semi-basement houses of similar design with canted bays to first floor level to the front.

## **2.0 Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history.

## **3.0 Current Planning Application**

3.1 The application is an amended proposal for a number of alterations to the property. The applicant proposes to install two rooflights, one on the front and one on the rear roof slope. The rooflight to the front would be 850mm x 700mm and the larger rooflight to the rear would be 2000mm x 1800mm; both rooflights would be fitted flush with the plane of the roof. As originally submitted the proposals included a larger roof light to the front.

3.2 The alterations at lower ground level to the rear involve the demolition of an original outside wc and the insertion of a new bay window. An existing period external back door would be relocated to the flank of the rear addition.

#### **4.0 Consultation**

4.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received.

4.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to neighbouring residents, to the relevant ward Councillors and to the Telegraph Hill Society.

##### Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

4.3 No responses received from local residents.

4.4 The Telegraph Hill Society has objected to the rooflight on the front roof slope. The Society considers roof lights to front roof slopes contribute to the statement in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal that “small changes to the external appearance of individual houses are beginning to erode the special interest of the area” and that they should be banned if the Council is to halt that erosion.

##### Amenity Societies Panel

The Panel objects to the proposed front rooflight. There are no objections to the proposed alterations to the rear elevation and insertion of rooflights to the rear.

#### **5.0 Policy Context**

##### 5.1 Introduction

5.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (DPD) (adopted in June 2011), those saved policies in the adopted Lewisham UDP (July 2004) that have not been replaced by the Core Strategy and policies in the London Plan (July 2011). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

##### 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework

5.4 The NPPF was published on 27th 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. In summary, this states, that for a period of 12 months from publication of the NPPF decision takers can give full weight to policies adopted since 2004 even if there is limited conflict with the NPPF. Following this period weight should be given to existing policies according to their consistency with the NPPF.

- 5.5 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy and saved UDP policies 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, 214 and 215 of the NPPF.

#### Regional Policy

5.6 London Plan (Consolidated July 2011)

- 5.7 The London Plan policies relevant to this application are

Policy 7.4: Local character

Policy 7.8: Heritage assets and archaeology

#### Local Policy

5.8 Core Strategy (June 2011)

- 5.9 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the London Plan and the saved policies of the Unitary Development 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:

Objective 10: Protect and Enhance Lewisham's Character

Policy 15: High quality design for Lewisham

Policy 16: Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

5.10 Unitary Development Plan (2004)

- 5.11 The saved policies of the UDP relevant to this application are:

URB 3: Urban Design

URB 6: Alterations and Extensions

URB 16: New Development, Changes of Use and Alterations to Buildings in Conservation Areas.

5.12 Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

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

5.14 Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal (March 2008)

- 5.15 This document analyses the special character of the conservation area.

## **6.0 Planning Considerations**

- 6.1 The main planning consideration is the impact of the proposed front rooflight on the appearance of the property, and on the appearance and character of the conservation area. It should be noted that since the property is a single family dwelling, the alterations to the rear, including the large rooflight in the rear roof slope, that have been included in the application may be carried out as 'permitted development'.
- 6.2 The Council's 2008 Telegraph Hill Character Appraisal refers to the uniform and cohesive design of the main house types in the area. The Character Appraisal refers to the issue of negative alterations to individual properties, including obtrusive rooflights to front roof slopes, that cumulatively erode the special character of the area.
- 6.3 The Telegraph Hill Society has objected to the application on the basis that the proposed front rooflight will contribute to the erosion of the character of the area.
- 6.4 The rooflight would be a Conservation Rooflight by the Rooflight Company. It would have a slim metal frame with a slim vertical glazing bar. It is acknowledged that the proposed rooflight would introduce a non-original feature to the property. However, it is considered that the proposed rooflight, being of a high quality conservation type, would not be overly large or obtrusive and in officers' view would not result in significant material damage to the character of the conservation area nor to the architectural characteristics of the original building.
- 6.5 The front rooflight has been reduced in size and is considered to be suitably located within the front roof slope. Its visual impact would be minimised by it being set into the roof slope, so that it would not protrude from the plane of the roof. The visual impact of the front rooflight when viewed from the street will be somewhat reduced by the presence of the hipped bay window roof and party wall parapets. Several properties in the vicinity have been fitted with roof lights to the front; there are existing rooflights at Nos. 78, 80, 84, 98, 100, 101, 102, and 106. These may have been installed prior to the introduction of the Article 4 Direction.
- 6.6 The proposed rooflight is considered to preserve the architectural characteristics of the property in line with UDP Policy URB 6, and the impact on the character of the conservation area is considered to be neutral. It is considered that the special character of the area would be preserved, consistent with UDP Policy URB 16.

### Consultations

- 6.7 Matters arising from the representations received in response to consultations have been addressed in the report above.

## **7.0 Conclusion**

- 7.1 The proposed rooflight is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the property, street scene and conservation area. The proposal is considered acceptable and permission is recommended.

## **8.0 Summary of Reasons for Grant of Planning Permission**

- 8.1 It is considered that proposal is appropriate in terms of its form and design and would not result in material harm to the appearance or character of the surrounding area, or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 7.6 Architecture and 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology in the London Plan (July 2011); Policies 15 High quality design in Lewisham and 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment in the Core Strategy (June 2011); and Policies URB 3 Urban Design, URB 6 Alterations and Extensions and URB 16 New Development, Changes of Use and Alterations to Buildings in Conservation Areas in the Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

## **9.0 RECOMMENDATION GRANT PERMISSION**