

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	4 LEATHWELL ROAD, DEPTFORD SE8 4JL	
Ward	Lewisham Central	
Contributors	Michael Forrester	
Class	PART 1	26 FEBRUARY 2015

Reg. Nos. DC/14/89216

Application dated 23.09.2014

Applicant Mr C Waite

Proposal The construction of a mansard roof extension, incorporating two dormer windows to the front and a dormer window and French doors with Juliette balcony to the rear

Applicant's Plan Nos. 1 of 8 rev C, 2 of 8 rev C, 3 of 8 rev C, 4 of 8 rev C, 5 of 8 rev C, 6 of 8 rev C (received 6/01/2015) & Site Plan.

Background Papers

- (1) Case File LE/149/4/TP
- (2) Local Development Framework Documents
- (3) The London Plan

Designation [Core Strategy, Site Allocations Local Plan or Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan] - Existing Use

## **1.0 Background**

1.1 This application was considered by Members at the meeting of Planning Committee C on the 18<sup>th</sup> November 2014. Members resolved to defer determination of the application in order to enable Officers and the applicant to seek to agree a proposal that meets the room size standards as recommended in the London Plan and to agree the materials to be used within the roof extension.

## **2.0 Additional Information Submitted**

2.1 Following the committee meeting, the applicant has submitted a set of revised plans. The changes include the alteration of 1 of the loft level bedrooms to a study and the alteration of a double bedroom to a single bedroom.

2.2 Additional detail has been added to the plans, including clarification of the height of the proposed extension and detailed 1:10 drawings of the parapet wall. Additional information has also been provided on the drawings with regard to the proposed materials. This includes lead flashing around the windows and Juliette balcony doors and the alteration from uPVC doors to timber. The balustrade for the Juliette balcony has also been reduced in width.

### **3.0 Property/Site Description**

- 3.1 The application site, No. 4 Leathwell Road is a two storey terraced house located on the western side of Leathwell Road. The property features a butterfly roof with a low parapet. The properties on surrounding streets (Leathwell Road and Elverson Road) share the same building and roof design. No property in the street currently possesses a mansard roof extension.
- 3.2 The property features an original rear two-storey projection with pitched roof. The property is not located within a conservation area, and is not a listed building.

### **4.0 Planning History**

- 4.1 DC/10/75059 – the construction of a single storey extension at the rear of 4 Leathwell Road SE8 together with alterations to the rear elevation – granted 22/09/2014.
- 4.2 There have been a number of similar mansard roof extensions proposed in Leathwell Road which are of relevance to this application. These are listed below:
- No. 13 Leathwell Road – refused 30/09/2014  
No. 6 Leathwell Road – refused 24/09/2014  
No. 13 Leathwell Road – refused 26/04/2012
- 4.3 The reasons for refusal relate to the scale and design, which would result in a visually intrusive addition to character and appearance of the area and be out of character with the characteristic roofscape within the street.

### **5.0 Current Planning Applications**

#### The Proposals

- 5.1 Permission is sought for the construction of a mansard roof extension. This would measure 1.3m above the existing parapet and is enclosed by two party walls measuring 1.4m high. The roof is to be clad in slate.
- 5.2 The chimney is to be relocated and raised up to a height of 9.2m above ground level, representing an increase of 0.8m.
- 5.3 The front elevation of the mansard incorporates two Upvc windows with the rear a single window and Juliette balcony serving the bedroom.
- 5.4 Internally, the roof extension would create two bedrooms and a bathroom, creating a five-bedroom property.

### **6.0 Consultation**

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

- 6.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

- 6.3 Neighbour notification letters were sent to surrounding properties and to local ward Councillors.

- 6.4 A letter of support has been received from the residents of No. 6 Leathwell Road raising the following points:

- Extension blends in well;
- Would encourage similar development of the terrace;
- Extension makes little difference compared with large unattractive development in the area;
- Recent increase in house prices and lack of family accommodation has made it difficult for couples to have families and remain in London.

- 6.5 Councillor Jeffrey has written in support of the proposal as follows:

- Seems unfair to reject this and similar applications as permission for similar extensions has been granted in St John's Conservation Area, also in context of proximity of Thurston Road developments.
- Opportunity for developing a new roofscape; additional advantage of producing more family sized homes which will encourage people to stay in the area developing a more stable community.
- Requested that this application be determined at planning committee.

**7.0 Policy Context**

Introduction

- 7.1 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)

- 7.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that 'if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

#### National Planning Policy Framework

- 7.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.
- 7.4 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

- 7.5 The other relevant national guidance is:

Design

#### London Plan (July 2011)

- 7.6 The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

#### London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- 7.7 The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

Housing (2012)

#### Core Strategy

- 7.8 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross

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

Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

### Development Management Local Plan

7.9 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

DM Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 22	Sustainable design and construction
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 31	Alterations/extensions to existing buildings
DM Policy 32	Housing design, layout and space standards

### Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006, revised 2012)

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

## **8.0 Planning Considerations**

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

- a) Design
- b) Impact on Adjoining Properties
- c) Sustainability and Energy

### Design

8.2 DM Policy 31 states that 'rear extensions will generally not be permitted where any part is higher than the height of the ridge of the main roof, or where the extension is not set back into the roof slope. Roof extensions on the street frontage of a building, particularly in a residential street will be resisted in favour of extensions to the rear of the building'.

8.3 In this instance, No. 4 Leathwell Road is a mid terrace property with an unaltered roof. Leathwell Road retains a consistent roofline of distinctive London 'butterfly' roofs. These roofs are hidden behind a parapet when viewed from the front, giving the impression of flat roofs. The V shaped roofs are visible from the rear and particularly on street corners, when viewed from the railway line and the DLR. Leathwell Road has a

consistent character and distinctive roofscape and most dwellings retain their decorative cornice at roof level which creates a strong, legible character. There are no mansard roofs in this street.

- 8.4 Proposals for mansard roofs have been refused at Nos. 6 (DC/14/88560) and 13 (DC/12/79594 and DC/14/88677). The grounds of refusal relate to the introduction of the roof extension as being out of character with the consistent rhythm of the prevailing roofscape in surrounding streets and would represent a visually intrusive addition to the streetscene.
- 8.5 The proposals for a mansard roof in effect would create a second storey, replacing the V shaped butterfly roof, set behind the parapet. It is considered that the additional storey would appear bulky and incongruous, dominating the streetscene, rising high up above the parapet. The raised party walls would be highly prominent from surrounding viewpoints and the raised chimney would stand much taller than any other in the street. This would only serve to emphasize the prominence of the roof extension.
- 8.6 It is noted that there are a number of mansard roof extensions in the adjacent streets which form the Brookmill Road Conservation Area, these are regrettable and are considered to be damaging to character and appearance of the conservation area. These mansard extensions in the conservation area however, are limited primarily to Albyn Road. The Council continues to assess mansard roof extensions on the merits of the individual case and they are generally resisted due to their obtrusive appearance.
- 8.7 Their introduction in this street, although not located in a conservation area, would be damaging to the terrace which is locally distinctive. To introduce a mansard style roof that would effectively result in an additional storey here would be damaging to the local character.
- 8.8 Following the deferral of the application from Planning Committee C meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> November the applicant has provided additional clarification on the height of the extension and included detailed 1:10 drawings of the parapet walls. Additional information has also been provided within the plans with regard to the proposed materials. This includes lead flashing around the windows and Juliette balcony doors, amendment from upvc doors to timber and the balustrade for the Juliette balcony has been reduced in width.
- 8.9 Previously officers raised concern (in addition to the massing) with regard to the detailing of the extension which was considered to be poor, the use of upvc and lack of detail for the balustrade.
- 8.10 It is considered that with the additional information submitted, clarity has been provided as to the appearance of the extension, and the reduction in width of the balustrade on the rear elevation is welcomed as this results in a cleaner appearance when viewed from the rear, however, Officers remain concerned at the scale and bulk of the extension which has not been amended.

- 8.11 The extension would continue to project up creating a second floor to the property which is not typical of Leathwell Road. The proposed extension would remain extremely prominent in the streetscene and it is considered it would be harmful to the character of the locality which is defined by traditional London V shaped roofs.
- 8.12 As the V shaped butterfly roof is characteristic of other parts of the north part of the borough, being a building form typical in London of houses built prior to 1860, should permission be granted, it would be more difficult to resist this type of alteration in other locations, resulting in a cumulative deterioration in the character of these properties and their surroundings.

#### Housing Issues

- 8.13 The plans as originally submitted proposed that the loft extension would accommodate two bedrooms and a bathroom. However, the size of the bedrooms measured approximately 7.5 sqm which is not adequate for a double bedroom and smaller than the recommended size of a single bedroom within the London Plan housing SPG (at 8 sqm).
- 8.14 The applicant has therefore revised the plans to change one of the loft level bedrooms to a study and amended the plans to show a single, rather than a double bedroom. This is considered acceptable, however, the applicant would be able to use both rooms as bedrooms; this is not for the Council to control.

#### Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 8.15 The rear windows would overlook the garden although this is considered not to cause significant harm in terms of loss of privacy. No objection is raised to the Juliette balcony from an amenity perspective. Although it is considered to be visually incongruous.
- 8.16 It is noted that no objections have been received from neighbouring occupiers.

#### Sustainability and Energy

- 8.17 The proposal complies with the principle of extending an existing building and maximises the use of a site. All habitable rooms would benefit from good levels of natural light and ventilation. For a development of this scale it is not considered appropriate or necessary to insist upon the inclusion of renewable energy provisions.

### **9.0 Community Infrastructure Levy**

- 9.1 The above development is not CIL liable.

### **10.0 Equalities Considerations**

- 10.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ("the Act") imposes a duty that the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to:-
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;

- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not;
  - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 10.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 10.3 The duty is a “have regard duty” and the weight to attach to it is a matter for the decision maker bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. In this matter there is no impact on equality.

## **11.0 Conclusion**

- 11.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 11.2 The introduction of a mansard roof extension would read as a second storey to this property in a road characterised by traditional London butterfly roofs. Although additional details have been submitted regarding the materials and detailing, the extension is considered to be of poor quality, appearing bulky and intrusive on the elevation. It is recommended that planning permission is refused.

## **12.0 RECOMMENDATION REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION** for the following reason:

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, massing and design, would be out of character with the consistent rhythm of the prevailing roofscape within the surrounding streets and would represent a visually intrusive addition harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 15 in the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 and DM Policy 31 in the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

## **INFORMATIVE**

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. Further discussion took place following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 18 November 2014 however In spite of the submission of further information, the proposals submitted are clearly contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan.