

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	93 Drakefell Road, SE4	
Ward	Telegraph Hill	
Contributors	Maeve Wylie	
Class	PART 1	17 th March 2016

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/15/94806
<u>Application dated</u>	11.12.15
<u>Applicant</u>	Ellen McBride
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a single storey rear extension and extension to rear roof slope, insertion of 1 rooflight on the rear roof slope and 2 on the side roof slope, together with the creation of a lightwell and insertion of 3 windows to the front of the property at basement level. The proposal will also include the excavation of the rear garden to provide stepped access down to the basement level at 93 Drakefell Road, SE4.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	Heritage Statement; Design and Access Statement; 428-100-A Rev P01; 428-100-B Rev P01; 428-101 Rev P01; 428-102 P01; 428-103 Rev P01; 428-104 Rev P01; 428-105 Rev P01; 428-110 P01; 428-111 Rev P01; 428-120 Rev P01; 428-201 Rev A; 428-202 Rev A; 428-203 Rev A; 428-204 Rev A; 428-220 Rev A; 428-301 Rev A (Received 11 December 2015) 428-205 Rev B; 428-206 Rev A; 428-210 Rev B; 428-211 Rev B; 428-212 Rev B; 428-300 Rev B; 428-106 Rev A (Received 5th February 2016)
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) This is Background Papers List (2) Case File LE/46/93/TP (3) Local Development Framework Documents (4) The London Plan
<u>Designation</u>	Telegraph Hill Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The site comprises a two storey, with basement, semi-detached single family dwelling located on the northern side of Drakefell Road, with the rear of the property facing onto properties on Pendrell Road.
- 1.2 The property has a distinctive L-shape due to the presence of a two storey projection which projects 8.6m from the rear wall of the main section of the house. This is characteristic for the majority of the properties on Drakefell Road.

- 1.3 The dwelling, like the majority on this road, has a basement level served by a high level window to the front which limits the amount of light coming into the basement area.
- 1.4 The property is constructed of London stock brick with a tile roof. In the front, rear and side elevation are sliding sash timber frame windows. To the front elevation there is a recessed door to one side with two storey canted bays to the other side.
- 1.5 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.
- 1.6 The property is located within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area and is subject to an Article 4 Direction. It is not a listed building. The PTAL is 4.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 None

3.0 Current Planning Application

- 3.1 This planning application relates to a number of different proposals to the host building of 93 Drakefell road, described below.

Single storey extension

- 3.2 A single storey rear extension would extend the existing conservatory. It would extend along the boundary with No. 95 Drakefell Road by 1.5 and would be finished with London stock brick to the east elevation and glass to the rear and west elevations and roof on a black steel frame. The highest point of the rear extension would be 2.7m, on the boundary with 95. The mono pitch roof would fall to the west where it would have an eaves height of 2.5m.

Rear roof extension

- 3.3 A dormer extension to the rear roof will be constructed to provide additional living space. There will also be a roof light on the rear roof slope and two roof lights to the side roof elevation. The rear dormer will be finished in zinc and include a timber sliding sash window. No alterations are proposed to the front slope.

Light well and three new windows to basement level front elevation

- 3.4 This aspect of the proposal would include the creation of a light well, with a length of 3m, width of 1.15m and depth of 0.6m, to the front elevation as well as three sliding windows to provide light to the basement level room. Materials to include white rendered wall, coping in sandstone and timber windows to the rear all of conservation design.

Excavation and creation of stairwell

- 3.5 The proposed stairwell would be located to the west of the rear extension, requiring excavation of part of the rear garden, and would provide access to the basement level from the rear garden.

Supporting Documents

- 3.6 Heritage Statement & Design and Access Statement

4.0 Consultation

- 4.1 Fourteen neighbouring properties and Telegraph Hill Ward Councillors were notified. A site notice was displayed and press advert.
- 4.2 The Telegraph Hill Society, Amenity Panel Societies and the councils Conservation Officer were also consulted.
- 4.3 The Telegraph Hill Society objected to this proposal. Their points are summarised below:

Rear roof extension and roof lights

- The rear dormer and roof lights will be visible from Pendrell Road due to the height difference between the two roads.
- Rear dormers are not a feature within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area.
- The rear dormer does not match up in alignment to the lower ground windows which is contrary to policy.
- Roof lights on the property would detract from the area, particularly at night.
- The rear roof light window's shape and size are out of keeping with the property's existing windows.

Single Storey ground floor extension

- Rear single storey extension with the loss of existing fabric is unacceptable.

Light well and windows

- No properties within this terrace have front basement windows or light wells and its introduction would affect the architectural integrity of the row of houses.
- The front garden is extremely short and the light well and windows will be very clear to pedestrians. Little will remain of garden if light well is approved.

- 4.4 The Amenity Societies Panel objected to this proposal stating:

“The Panel objects to the demolition of existing fabric this proposal involves. The replacement conservatory is wholly out of keeping with the building. The resized rear windows are poorly considered and are potentially visible from public viewpoints. The proposed light well means that the property no longer matches with the neighbouring property and affects the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached buildings.”

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.

5.2 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).

5.3 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.

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework

5.5 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)'.

5.6 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.

5.7 London Plan (March 2015)

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

Policy 5.4 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

5.9 Core Strategy

5.10 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:-

Spatial Policy 2 Regeneration and Growth Areas

Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

5.11 Development Management Local Plan

5.12 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:-

DM Policy 1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character

DM Policy 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings

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

5.13 Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

5.14 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) Principle of Development
- b) Design and Conservation
- c) Impact on Adjoining Properties

Design & Conservation

- 6.2 Core Strategy Policy 15 seek to ensure that a high standard of design is upheld; proposals must complement the existing development, townscape and character.
- 6.3 Core Strategy Policy 16 states that the Council will ensure that the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets and their settings, conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, registered historic parks and gardens and other non designated assets such as locally listed buildings, will continue to be monitored, reviewed, enhanced and conserved according to the requirements of government planning policy guidance, the London Plan policies, local policy and English Heritage best practice.
- 6.4 DM Policy 30 states that the Council will require all development proposals to attain a high standard of design, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings. The retention and refurbishment of existing buildings that make a positive contribution to the environment will be encouraged and should influence the character of new development and a sense of place. An adequate response to how the scheme relates to the existing street including its building frontages will be required including:
- The quality and durability of building materials that either match or complement the existing and their sensitive use on the development and the justification behind the choice.
 - The activity and visual interest for the public provided by the development at ground floor level with the provision of windows and doors to provide physical and visual links between buildings and the public domain.
 - A statement describing the significance of heritage asset, including its setting will be required for proposals that impact on such an asset.
- 6.5 DM Policy 31 relates to alterations to existing buildings and requires development 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. It further states that high quality matching or complimentary materials should be used in relation to the context.
- 6.6 DM Policy 36 states that the Council, having paid special attention to the special interest of its Conservation Areas, and the desirability of preserving and or enhancing their character and or appearance, will not grant planning permission where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.
- 6.7 This application relates to a number of different proposals at the host building 93 Drakefell Road. Special consideration must be had towards design and materials as this property is situated within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area.

Rear roof extension

- 6.8 A rear roof extension is proposed together with one roof light to the rear roof slope and two to the side roof slope. The rear dormer would measure 1.2m in width, 1.15m in depth and 0.6m in height.
- 6.9 It is considered by Planning Officers and the Conservation Officer that the scale of this dormer in a conservation area is appropriate as it does not detract from the host building and does not compromise the character of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. The dormer is significantly smaller than the width and height of the rear roof slope. The dormer is well spaced and positioned within the existing roof slope, set in from the party wall on each side and down from the ridge. The width of this single dormer would not exceed half the width of the roof.
- 6.10 The rear dormer would be set back approximately 1m from the eaves of the roof and at least 1.5m from the party wall boundary with no. 95. It would be finished in zinc flashing and the window will be timber sliding sash, matching the existing materials of the dwelling.
- 6.11 The roof lights would be considered acceptable as they are conservation style, flush with the roof slope, and there would be restricted view of them from the public area. The windows would be needed to make the loft conversion functional in terms of receiving sufficient sunlight and will serve the bathroom, bedroom and staircase. A window specification has been provided that states the windows to the side roof slope will be 565mm in width and 725mm in height. The larger scale window to the rear will be 717mm in width and 1333mm in height.
- 6.12 Objections have been raised by the Telegraph Hill Society and The Amenity Societies Panel regarding the installation of the dormer roof extension. Whilst their comments have been taken into consideration, it is considered that the proposed rear dormer would be of a modest size, it would not cover the full width of the rear roofslope and is therefore subordinate to the rear elevation and roofslope. The dormer would be zinc and although it would look different to the existing slate tiles it is considered that the lead would be of high quality material which would be in accordance with DM 31 where it is stated that "materials should be complementary" and therefore it is acceptable in this regard. The window proposed to be installed in the dormer would be timber framed, sliding-sash. Officers consider the proposed dormer extension would be subordinate to the existing roofscape and would successfully integrate with and preserve the architectural character of the building and not harm the character of the conservation area.
- 6.13 The Telegraph Hill Society mentions that rear dormers are not a feature of the Telegraph Hill Conservation area however officers note that a number of similar styled dormers have been approved on Drakefell Road. An objection was also raised in relation to the proposed windows in the roof slope not aligning with the lower ground windows but as this property has a hip-to-gable roof it was difficult to achieve this without compromising the functionality of the windows to serve the rooms. The proposed roof lights to the side slope are considered acceptable as they are conservation style and are of suitable size. Officers consider that the rear roof lights are acceptable in size and are in keeping with the existing windows on the property. Officers feel that there will be limited impact from the light spill because of the height of the property and its closeness to 91 Drakefell which restricts views on the roofslope.

6.14 The design, scale and materials proposed for the rear dormer and rear rooflights are considered to be acceptable and would not harm the character or appearance of the main dwellinghouse or the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal complies with Core Strategy Policies 15 and 16, DM Policies 30, 31 and 36 and paragraph 6.7 of the Residential Standards SPD.

Ground floor rear extension

6.15 The rear extension would be single storey with a mono pitch roof. The proposed extension would replace an original rear projection and provide a dining area to the adjoining kitchen. The extension would extend 1.5m from the existing parting wall with a height of 2.7m from its highest point and 2.5m from its lowest point, as the roof slopes downwards slightly from east to west. The existing extension has a ridge height of 2.5m. The width of the extension would be 3m, the same as the existing conservatory. Access from the conservatory to the garden would be via French doors.

6.16 The proposed contemporary design is considered to respect the character and style of the property. The extension is entirely contained to the rear of the property and the rear wall height respects the character of the window units on the first floor.

6.17 Due to the existing fence at Pendrell Road, between the break in dwellings, the single storey extension would not be visible from the public realm.

6.18 Officers consider that the proposal is subordinate to the host building and would not harm the character of the building.

6.19 A large proportion of the extension would be finished in glass, including the rear and west elevation and the roof. Although this does not match the existing materials officers feel that the materials are complementary to the host building. In terms of the design this feature will have no impact on the Conservation area as it is not visible from the public realm.

6.20 Therefore, it is considered that the design, the size and the location of the proposed extension are acceptable. The Council's Conservation Officer made no objection to the proposed.

Light well and three windows

6.21 At present this dwelling has a basement which receives light only through a small scale, high level window. The present window is characteristic for this row of terrace houses, although dwellings on the opposite side of the road have light wells with 3 front elevation windows. The conservation officer had no objection to this proposal but asked that the agent supplied plans which showed the whole front garden area and the horn detail to the windows, which were subsequently provided.

6.22 While the light well would decrease the front garden area of the property it would still be of a scale which is acceptable for a double storey terrace property. The light well will be finished in sandstone and tiles to match the existing. The lightwell would have a length of 3m, width of 1.15m and depth of 0.6m. The Telegraph Hill Society raised an objection that the creation of the lightwell would leave little of a front garden but officers feel that the 0.4m depth of the light well to the front window is modest considering the 2.6m of garden depth that would be remain.

- 6.23 The hedge and brick wall, 1.2m in height, fronting the road would act as a visual barrier to the light well and windows meaning the front alterations can only be viewed from a limited section of public highway. Whilst it would be the first property on this terrace to have this feature, it is not within a Flood Zone and the extent of the excavation is considered to be relatively modest.
- 6.24 In terms of amenity there will be ample space to the west front elevation of the property for bin storage. 800mm of tiling is still retained along the front, between the light well and the planting, with the average size of a bin measuring the width of a 360 litre bin being 620mm. It is noted that no other properties on this terrace have lightwell to the front of their properties but they can be seen on properties on the opposite side of on Drakefell Road.
- 6.25 The proposed windows would be timber sliding sash and would match the existing front elevation in terms of design, scale and openings. The three windows would have matching horn detail to the existing front elevation windows and the wall would remain rendered at basement level. Officers do not object to the proposed installation of timber sliding sash types as this is a strong feature within the conservation area. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be consistent with Core Strategy Policy 15 and 16 or DM Policies 30, 31 and 36.
- 6.26 The creation of a light well and 3 windows would significantly improve the use of the basement level of this property by providing much needed light and ventilation. Policy DM 1 supports sustainable development, which includes enabling residents to improve their houses, provided other policies are met. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be consistent with the relevant policies.

Excavation and stairwell

- 6.27 The proposed excavation would take place at the rear garden, to the west side of the property. This proposal will provide access to the basement level from the garden. This would not result in substantial loss of the garden amenity as there would still be a significant proportion of garden remaining.
- 6.28 The excavation and proposed stairwell would be 2.8m in depth, 5.1m in length and 0.95-1.6m in width. The depth of the stairwell would not extend beyond the proposed extension.
- 6.29 Officers consider that the principle of this element of development is acceptable as it does not impact the conservation area, or detract from the host building and the rear garden would retain a depth of 21m.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.30 Core Strategy Policy 15 states that new development should be designed in a way that is sensitive to the local context. More specific to this, DM Policy 31 seeks to ensure that residential extensions should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity to adjoining houses and their back gardens. It must therefore be demonstrated that proposed extensions, the creation of a lightwell to the front and rear stairwell are neighbourly and that significant harm will not arise with respect to overbearing impact, loss of outlook, overshadowing, loss of light or general noise and disturbance.

- 6.31 The proposed extensions would be on the north elevation of the dwelling facing onto the rear elevations of dwellings on Pendrell Road. With regard to the impact upon the neighbours at No.91 and 95 Drakefell Road it is considered that the ground floor extension would not result in loss of daylight, sense of enclosure, loss of outlook and privacy due to the single storey nature of the extension and modest additional depth.
- 6.32 With regard to the rear dormer, the impact on neighbours at 91 and 95 Drakefell Road would not be significant given the narrowness of the dormer which would channel views rearward and away from the neighbouring gardens. The distance from the dormer to the boundary with Pendrell Road properties would be at least 21m and to the rear elevations of those properties would be approximately 36m. At this distance it is not considered that significant impacts on privacy would occur.
- 6.33 The proposed rooflight to the rear elevation would provide daylight to a staircase, while the side rooflights would provide light to the new bedroom to be created in the roof space. They would not be considered to have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties due to their positioning on the roof slopes.
- 6.34 There would be no impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties from the proposed alteration and excavation of the basement level to create a light well and a rear stairwell as levels of sunlight, daylight, outlook, privacy and noise would remain the same.
- 6.35 No objections were received from neighbouring properties. The proposed development is considered to have no significant impact on the amenities of adjoining properties. This proposal is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 7.2 Officers consider the proposed extensions and other works to be acceptable with regards to design, conservation and neighbouring amenity and the scheme is therefore considered acceptable. The development proposed is considered to have no negative impact on the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area due to a combination of high quality materials proposed and the development being modest in size relative to the host building.

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:

Heritage Statement; Design and Access Statement; 428-100-A Rev P01; 428-100-B Rev P01; 428-101 Rev P01; 428-102 P01; 428-103 Rev P01; 428-104 Rev P01; 428-105 Rev

P01; 428-110 P01; 428-111 Rev P01; 428-120 Rev P01; 428-201 Rev A; 428-202 Rev A; 428-203 Rev A; 428-204 Rev A; 428-220 Rev A; 428-301 Rev A (Received 11 December 2015) 428-205 Rev B; 428-206 Rev A; 428-210 Rev B; 428-211 Rev B; 428-212 Rev B; 428-300 Rev B; 428-106 Rev A (Received 5th February 2016)

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) (a) The development shall be constructed in those materials as submitted namely:

London Stock Brick, Zinc cladding on dormer, Glass French doors & Timber sliding sash windows

(b)The scheme shall be carried out in full accordance with those details, as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the design is delivered in accordance with the details submitted and assessed so that the development achieves the necessary high standard and detailing in accordance with Policies 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.

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 to show the full extent of the development to the front garden from the proposed lightwell.