

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	88 Drakefell Road, SE14 5SJ	
Ward	Telegraph Hill	
Contributors	Kate Hayler	
Class	PART 1	21 May 2015

Reg. Nos.

DC/14/90279

Application dated

17/12/2014 [as revised on 30/03/2015]

Applicant

Gruff Ltd on behalf of Mr and Mrs Elbourne

Proposal

The construction of a single-storey extension to the rear of 88 Drakefell Road SE14, together with the installation of replacement double glazed timber sash windows to the front.

Applicant's Plan Nos.

G106-100, G106-101, G106-120, G106-121, G106-122, G106-130, G106-140, G106-141, G106-142 (Existing front elevation), Design & Access Statement & Heritage Statement (Received 18/12/2014) and G106-200 RevA, G106-201 RevA, G106-202 RevA, G106-300 RevA, G106-301 RevA, G106-400 RevA, G106-401 RevA, G106-402 RevA, G106-900 RevA, G106-950 RevA, sk-014 RevA and Revised Design Statement (Received 31/03/2015).

Background Papers

- (1) Case File DE/46/88/TP
- (2) Local Development Framework Documents
- (3) The London Plan

Designation

PTAL 3
Telegraph Hill Article 4(2) Direction
Telegraph Hill Conservation Area
Not a Listed Building
Unclassified

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application property is a semi-detached Victorian dwellinghouse on the south side of Drakefell Road. The ground level to the rear slopes down to the railway line and as a result of this the property is two stories fronting Drakefell Road but has a 3 storey original extension to the rear and a semi-basement utility space beneath the house. A single storey lean-to extension has recently been constructed to the rear of the property.
- 1.2 The application site is in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area but is not in the vicinity of any listed buildings.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 2014 – Planning permission was granted for the construction of a single-storey extension to the rear of 88 Drakefell Road SE14, together with the installation of replacement double glazed timber sash windows to the front.

3.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposals

- 3.1 The current planning application seeks the demolition of the existing rear extension and the removal of the existing side bay window and its replacement with a single storey wrap around extension that would create an open plan living room/kitchen/dining area.
- 3.2 The proposed extension would infill the existing side return to match the width of the existing dwelling and would then be stepped in as the site boundary angles in to maintain a side access along the side of the property with a minimum width of 900mm. It would therefore measure 1.9m wide and step in to measure 1.3m wide towards the rear of the house. The rear extension would measure 2.6m deep by 5.0m wide. The extension would be constructed in London Stock brick and feature Flemish bonding so that it matched the existing brickwork of the host property. The roof would feature an apex arrangement with two pitched rooflights. The roof would be finished in artificial slate and would feature a third rooflight over the rear extension. The applicant has confirmed that the windows and doors would be aluminium framed and the glazed units would match the dimensions of the windows on the floors above.
- 3.3 Following concerns raised by the Telegraph Hill Society, the applicant has confirmed that the bonding of the brickwork will be Flemish bond. In addition, the proposals have been amended so that the rear windows and doors match the alignment and proportions of the windows on the floors above; the size of the proposed rooflights has been reduced and the applicant has confirmed that the rooflights above the kitchen will be of obscure glazed glass and have blinds fitted to reduce light spillage; the details of the new timber sash windows to the front have been amended so that the horns match exactly those on the existing property and the glazing has been amended to match the illustrations in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal with 2-2 glazing to the upper floors and 1-1 glazing to the lower bay.

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. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 4.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and businesses in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors were also consulted.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

- 4.3 One letter of objection was received from the Telegraph Hill Society. The following matters were raised:

- Rear extension would be visible to pedestrians crossing the railway bridge;
- Concerned by number of large side/rear extensions which destroy large amounts of original fabric, particularly where visible from the public realm;
- The TH Conservation Area Appraisal highlights that the rear of properties in the conservation area are largely as uniform as the front. There is concern that this is being further eroded;
- DM Policy 36.4b states that development in the conservation area should be refused which in isolation would lead to less than substantial harm to the building or area but cumulatively would affect the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- There is significant loss of original fabric which would result in substantial harm to the building;
- Compromises the integrity of the building by removing side bay and wall;
- Windows at the rear and side are of an uncompromising modern design and destroy the articulation of the rear elements of the building;
- Form of roof does not respect or complement original building;
- Rear extension presents blank walls free of any detailing and will have an adverse effect on neighbouring amenity;
- No details of bonding provided;
- Proposed roof lights would result in light spillage;
- Proposed windows show wrong type of window horn;
- Proposed glazing pattern for the windows is incorrect

Thames Water:

No objection subject to informatives

ASP:

The extension is overlarge and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area. The proposal involves the loss of a bay window to the side elevation of the back addition which is a characteristic and attractive feature of this particular house type. The large area of roof lights would also give rise to light spillage as would the large glazed window and doors which were of a totally inappropriate design for a Victorian house in a Conservation Area.

5.0 Policy Context

Introduction

- 5.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
 - (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
 - (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 5.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning 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

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states 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)'.
- 5.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

Other National Guidance

- 5.5 On 6 March 2014, DCLG launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) resource. This replaced a number of planning practice guidance documents.

London Plan (March 2015)

On 10 March 2015 the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) was adopted. The policies relevant to this application are:

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

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

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

Housing (2012)

Core Strategy

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

Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency
Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham
Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Development Management Local Plan

- 5.7 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

- 5.8 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
DM Policy 36	New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

5.9 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.

6.0 Planning Considerations

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

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

Design and Conservation

6.2 Development Management Local Plan DM Policy 31 'Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions' states that "*alterations and extensions, including roof extensions will be required to be of high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used, appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.*"

6.3 DM Policy 36 states that the Council will not grant planning permission where development would be incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings, form and materials.

6.4 The proposals comprise changes to the windows at the front of the property and the construction of a single storey wrap around extension that would replace the existing single storey rear extension.

6.5 Initially, the glazing pattern for the proposed front timber sash windows were shown to match the existing windows in the property. Following objections raised by the Telegraph Hill Society, the windows have been altered so that the first floor windows have a vertical glazing bar and the ground floor windows do not. This matches the illustrations in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal and the Council's Conservation Officer has raised no objections to this approach. The Telegraph Hill Society also objected to the type of window horn proposed. The details of the window horn have been amended to match the horns on the existing property and the Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that this is an acceptable approach. The proposed replacement windows are therefore considered to be acceptable.

6.6 In terms of the proposed single storey extensions, the proposed materials (brick, high quality artificial slate and aluminium framed window and doors) and brick bonding (Flemish) will match or complement the materials of the host property. Whilst the roof form of the side extension is contemporary, it is considered to be one that pays homage to the traditional pitched roof form and cleverly seeks to reduce its impact on the host property in terms of its bulk. It is therefore

considered to complement the form of the host building. Following objections to the design of the windows and doors, the applicant has made amendments which ensure that the door is in line with the windows of the floors above and that the proportion of the glazing bars matches the proportions of the windows on the floors above. This is considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained in the Residential Standards SPD.

- 6.7 The Telegraph Hill Society have suggested that the proposed windows and door are of 'large uncompromising modern design and destroy the articulation of the rear elements of the building'. There is no policy requirement that prevents the introduction of contemporary elements provided that they complement the host building and given that these openings reflect the alignment and proportion of other openings, these elements are considered to be acceptable from a design perspective.
- 6.8 It is considered that the design of the proposals would have an acceptable relationship with the host property.
- 6.9 The Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies 88 Drakefell Road as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The Appraisal states that "being in good condition and relatively unaltered externally, all of the 19th century buildings make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the conservation area". This is despite the fact that a large number of these properties on Drakefell Road include single storey rear extensions. This would imply that despite having rear extensions, these buildings continue to make a positive contribution to the special character of the conservation area.
- 6.10 The character appraisal goes on to discuss the condition of the conservation area (which is described as good) and list the type of small changes to the external appearance of individual houses which are beginning to erode the special interest of the area. These include the replacement of timber sash windows with uPVC or windows in a different style, enclosure of recessed front porches, obtrusive rooflights located in the front roofslope, unauthorised satellite dishes, replacement of slate with concrete tiles or poor quality artificial slate, incorrect bonding of new brickwork, rendering/ pebble-dashing of original brickwork, removal of small architectural details such as tiled front paths, finials, ridge tiles and clay chimney pots. The list does not include additions to the rear of the property.
- 6.11 The Telegraph Hill Society have objected to the loss of the existing bay window to the side of the property and the side wall and state that this would be detrimental to the integrity of the building and, when considered cumulatively with changes to the rear of buildings in the conservation area, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.12 The Society state that the Conservation Area Appraisal makes reference to the rear of properties being as uniform as the front. However, on further examination, the Appraisal states that "there are good views of the backs of houses, as uniform in design as the fronts". The appraisal refers to the original design of the buildings and remains silent on whether the properties are generally unaltered to the rear. An aerial view of this part of Drakefell Road reveals that many of the properties feature rear extensions. The Society's objection states that inappropriate development has eroded this feature. However, the Appraisal does not list

changes to the rear of properties in the types of small changes to the external appearances of individual houses that are beginning to erode the special interest of the area (Section 5, Condition of the Conservation Area). This objection to the application is therefore recommending changes to the way that the Council makes decisions on rear extensions based on the Society's opinion that rear extensions are 'eroding the character of the area'. Any changes to the SPD to include rear extensions in the list in Section 5 would need to be supported by appropriate evidence being gathered and public consultation being undertaken. This process has not occurred and it would not be appropriate for the Council to start making decisions on this basis.

- 6.13 The rear of the properties on this part of Drakefell Road have been extensively altered with a number of single storey rear and side extensions and conservatories, including a large and very modern wrap around extension at number 82. The Council's Conservation Officer has not objected to the proposal on the basis that the lower ground floor of the rear of the building is not overly visible from the public realm, including the railway bridge that links the two sides of Aspinall Road (where views are impeded by the mesh over the bridge, the trees on the embankment and the angle at which the rear elevations are visible). The side bay is not overly visible from the public realm. It would therefore not be reasonable to refuse planning permission on the basis of the loss of this feature, especially given that planning permission has recently been granted at 82 Drakefell Road for a similar wrap around extension (DC/13/84319) that resulted in the removal of the bay.
- 6.14 The host building is not a listed building nor a locally listed building. The guidance contained in the NPPF states that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be given to the asset's conservation. If the Council were to require the retention of the bay, it would preclude any form of development to the side of the property (despite the fact that it is not overly visible from the public realm) which is considered to unjustifiably fetter the development potential of the property. It is considered that preventing the removal of the bay would be seeking to afford the building with a level of protection that is inappropriate to its status and has no policy justification.
- 6.15 There are a number of extensions to the rear of the buildings on this part of Drakefell Road but these extensions are not overly visible from the public realm and therefore it is not accepted that they can be said to have an unacceptable impact either singly or cumulatively on the appearance of the conservation area. The removal of the existing single storey extension and its replacement with a wrap around single storey extension is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on the conservation area.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.16 DM Policy 31 states that residential extensions should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity (including sunlight and daylight) to adjoining houses and their back gardens. The policy also states that residential extensions should retain an accessible and usable private garden that is appropriate in size in relation to the size of the property, and retain 50% of the garden area.
- 6.17 The property has a large rear garden and the proposal would result in well in excess of 50% of the existing garden area being retained. Concerns have been

raised that the proposal would have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers as a result of the proposed side wall which is largely blank but features a large window. It is worth noting that neighbouring occupiers have not objected to the proposal.

- 6.18 The existing relationship with the property at 90 Drakefell Road is that both properties are semi-detached and are separated by a path to the side of each dwelling that provides side access. There is an existing door and set of stairs from the ground floor of 88 Drakefell Road that provides opportunity for overlooking into the neighbouring property. The impact of any other facing windows is limited by the existence of a timber fence.
- 6.19 The proposal would result in the removal of the door and stairs from ground floor level and their replacement with a window. This is considered to have a positive impact on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The wrap around extension will be closer to the neighbouring property than the existing side wall and a smaller separation distance will be created by the path providing side access. The extension will be closer to the side windows at number 90 Drakefell Road, but it is considered that the apex design of the roof will go some way to mitigating any increased sense of enclosure by creating interest and reducing the bulk of the extension (in comparison to the flat roof recently approved at 82 Drakefell Road). The existing timber fence will continue to provide screening between facing windows which will be offset by the proposed design rather than aligned. The proposed side wall does not feature any significant detailing but given the extent of the wall that will be visible above the fence, this is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.
- 6.20 Concern has been raised about light spillage from the proposed rooflights. The size of the rooflights has been amended and the applicant has confirmed that the rooflights above the kitchen will be of obscure glazed glass and have blinds fitted to reduce light spillage. It is recommended that this is secured by condition.
- 6.21 On balance, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

Sustainability and Energy

- 6.22 The proposal complies with the principle of extending an existing building and maximises the use of a site. For a development of this scale it is not considered appropriate or necessary to insist upon the inclusion of renewable energy facilities.

7.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.1 The above development is not CIL liable.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 8.2 Officers consider that the proposed wrap around extension is of an acceptable design and would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. The replacement windows and extension would not adversely impact the character

and appearance of the conservation area. The scheme is therefore considered acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

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

G106-100, G106-101, G106-120, G106-121, G106-122, G106-130, G106-140, G106-141, G106-142 (Existing front elevation), Design & Access Statement & Heritage Statement (Received 18/12/2014) and G106-200 RevA, G106-201 RevA, G106-202 RevA, G106-300 RevA, G106-301 RevA, G106-400 RevA, G106-401 RevA, G106-402 RevA, G106-900 RevA, G106-950 RevA, sk-014 RevA and Revised Design Statement (Received 31/03/2015).

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) The rooflights installed above the kitchen in the extension hereby approved shall be fitted as obscure glazed and with blinds and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To avoid any loss of amenity and to comply with DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

Informatives:

- a. 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.
- b. There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The

applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the options available at this site.

- c. Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921.