

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE B	
Report Title	30 Lampmead Road, London SE12 8QL	
Ward	Lee Green	
Contributors	Karl Fetterplace	
Class	PART 1	20 OCTOBER 2016

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/16/97144
<u>Application dated</u>	18.6.2016
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr/Ms Williams
<u>Proposal</u>	The reconstruction of collapsed elements of the house at 30 Lampmead Road SE12, together with the construction of a rear roof extension, single storey side and rear extension and alterations to the existing rear fenestration.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	219-PL-E-01, 219-PL-E-02 Rev A, 219-PL-E-03 Rev A, 219-PL-E-04 received 20 June 2016; 219-PL-P-01 Rev C, 219-PL-P-02 Rev D, 219-PL-P-03 Rev D, 219-PL-P-11, 219-PL-P-12, 219-PL-P-15, Photomontage 1, Photomontage 2, Design & Access Statement including Heritage Statement Rev C (31 August 2016, PlanStudio), Lewisham Planning Precedents (PlanStudio), VMZinc Facades Guidelines for Design and Specification, VMZinc Gallery 2016 Edition, VMZ Standing Seam Installation Guide January 2016 received 5 September 2016.
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File LE/433/30/TP (2) Core Strategy (2011) (3) Development Management Local Plan (2014) (4) The London Plan (2015)
<u>Designation</u>	PTAL 2 Lee Manor Conservation Area Lee Manor Article 4(2) Direction Not a Listed Building Area of Archaeological Priority - Lee Unclassified Road
<u>Screening</u>	N/A

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application property is a two storey plus loft space end of terrace Victorian single family dwellinghouse. It is located on the northern side of Lampmead Road, at its junction with Aislibie Road and hence the dwelling side elevation and upper part of the rear elevation are visible from Aislibie Road, although the rear elevation is mostly obscured by the rear projection and garden wall. On 7 June 2016, the existing roof structure and part of the façade collapsed. The dwelling had a pitched main roof and has a mono-pitch roof on the original rear projection. At the back of the rear projection there is a single storey extension with a lean-to roof. The elevation facing the side return has a bay window.
- 1.2 The dwelling sits in a terrace of seven dwellings that lie on the outer boundary of the Lee Manor Conservation Area, in an area that was added to the conservation area in 2008. The site is also subject to the Lee Manor Article 4(2) Direction.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 **PRE/16/2211:** Duty Planner advice was sought regarding the construction of a rear roof extension, ground and first floor extension to the rear, alterations to the window fenestration to the rear and the installation of two rooflights to the front roofslope. It was advised that the rear roof extension and full height window to the rear may be acceptable subject to the submission of further details. It was also advised that the first floor extension to the rear projection and two front rooflights were unlikely to be supported.
- 2.2 **DC/16/96313:** The construction of single-storey rear and side extension, rear roof extension and alteration to existing rear fenestration at 30 Lampmead Road SE12.
- 2.3 Application withdrawn on 17 June 2016 by applicant as due to the collapse of the house, the Council was unable to determine an application to make extensions to the house.
- 2.4 **EC/16/173:** Following the collapse of elements of the dwelling, an enforcement case was opened. The description of the alleged breach was the potential rebuild of a collapsed house in a conservation area. The applicant was advised to withdraw the existing planning application (DC/16/96313) and re-submit a new planning application.

3.0 Current Planning Application

- 3.1 This application is for the reconstruction of collapsed elements of the house at 30 Lampmead Road SE12, together with a rear roof extension, single storey side and rear extension and alterations to the existing rear fenestration.
- 3.2 The extensions and alterations to the rear fenestration proposed in this application are the same as those proposed in the previously withdrawn application. The purpose of this current application is to add the reconstruction of collapsed elements of the house to the proposed works. These would be reconstructed in their original form – in natural slates and yellow and red stock brick - with the

exception of those elements that would have otherwise been altered to facilitate the proposed works.

- 3.3 The bay window in the side return would be demolished to allow for a ground floor extension that would increase the footprint of the rear projection (including single storey lean-to) by 1.1m to the rear and 0.9m to the side. The setback to the side boundary would be 0.7m. The rear extension would have a flat roof. Its height was reduced from 2.8m to 2.5m above existing ground level following concerns raised by officers. This would sit below the side boundary wall, which has a height of 2.8m. The garden level is proposed to be lowered by 0.12m to facilitate this extension. The extension would be faced in yellow London stock brick to match the existing and would include roof lights and a glass section. The bi-fold doors at the rear of the extension would be full width, with dark grey aluminium frames.
- 3.4 The rear roof extension would be set in from the side of the roof by 0.5m and set back 1m from the eaves. It would have chamfered edges, with windows for its full width. It would be clad in dark grey standing seam zinc. Natural slate would be used.
- 3.5 The alterations to the existing rear fenestration include a 0.5m double height fixed window that would span from ground floor to first floor, adjoined by an openable dark grey aluminium framed window at first floor level. The existing uPVC windows would be replaced by dark grey timber sash windows.
- 3.6 Officers advised the applicant that whilst the scheme may be acceptable in principle, a greater level of detail would be required to satisfy officers that a high quality scheme could be delivered. The applicant then submitted detailed drawings, product information, precedents and samples of the proposed zinc and slate.
- 3.7 The scheme has been revised from that which was the subject of duty planner advice, in that the rear projection is no longer proposed to be extended to the rear at first floor level, two front rooflights have been omitted and the existing chimney stacks are proposed to be retained.

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 all adjoining premises and the relevant ward Councillors. No responses were received.
- 4.3 The Lee Manor Society objected to the proposal, as outlined below:
- We have no objection to the proposed re-instatement of the original Victorian frontage and roof but proposals for the rear of the building concern us deeply.
 - The proposed roof extension is completely out of character with the Lee Manor conservation area character appraisal and it is far too large for a house of this size. The house is on a corner plot and is very visible from many points of the compass. Lewisham has successfully contested appeals by householders

against its policy of insisting on modest, appropriate roof extensions. This extension is ugly, overlarge and totally inappropriate on this property. We object to it on these grounds. The applicant has submitted examples of other ugly roof extensions in Lampmead Road but these were all built before Conservation Area status was extended to Lampmead Road in 2007 and are of no relevance to this application.

- The applicant is also proposing an incoherent arrangement of windows to the rear of the building in a modern style that appears to match the proposal for the roof extension. These windows would completely destroy the harmony of the door and window arrangements to the rear and should be refused. We object to the proposed window arrangements to the rear.
- We also object to the proposed removal of the rear side bay window. Although not visible from the street, these rear bays are a distinctive feature of many houses in the conservation area and should be retained. The gain of minimal interior space does not justify the loss of this feature. The Telegraph Hill Society has made a similar argument on properties in its conservation area and has had some success with this.

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.

The London Plan (March 2015) incorporating March 2016 Minor Alterations

- 5.6 The London Plan 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)

- 5.7 The London Plan's Housing SPG's is relevant to this application.

Core Strategy

- 5.8 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
Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Development Management Local Plan

- 5.9 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 lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

5.10 The following policies are considered to be relevant 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

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

5.11 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 relevant planning considerations are the impact on the design and appearance of the existing building and conservation area and whether the amenity of neighbouring properties is affected.

Impact on the design and appearance of the existing building and conservation area

6.2 Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that 'in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area'. Paragraph 131 states that 'in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of new development making positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

6.3 London Plan Policy 7.8 states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

6.4 Core Strategy Policy 15 states that the Council will apply national and regional policy and guidance to ensure highest quality design and the protection or enhancement of the historic and natural environment, which is sustainable, accessible to all, optimises the potential of sites and is sensitive to the local context and responds to local character.

- 6.5 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.
- 6.6 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.
- 6.7 DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions states that development proposals for alterations and extensions, including roof extensions will be required to be of a 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.
- 6.8 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 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 is incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.
- 6.9 Although the rear roofslope extension would introduce a feature that would affect the uniformity of the roofscape of the surrounding buildings when viewed from Aislibie Street, given the high quality detail and design material it is not considered that this roof extension would have an adverse impact on the Lee Manor Conservation Area if it is delivered to the high standard that is demonstrated in the plans. It is noted that the view from Aislibie Street is a view that is from outside the conservation area. The view of the opposite end of this terraced row is not prominent due to vegetation and the presence of existing buildings at the intersection of Lenham and Lampmead Roads. Nos. 18 and 22 Lampmead Road have L-shaped rear roof extensions, with the extension on the main roof slope being full width. This therefore diminishes to an extent, the quality of this terrace, although it is acknowledged that these roof extensions pre-date the inclusion of this terrace in the conservation area. Further, the Lee Manor Conservation Area Character Appraisal notes the importance of the front elevations of this terrace, but does not comment on the rear roofscape.
- 6.10 The walls of the dormer are proposed to be clad in pale grey standing seam zinc, with the windows and doors being a pale grey powder coated aluminium to match the zinc. These materials are considered to be acceptable in a conservation context and following the provision of slate and zinc samples, product information and detailed drawings to officers at a scale of 1:20 of the rear roof extension and

double height rear window, it is considered that a high quality design can be delivered.

- 6.11 This proposal is considered acceptable by officers, despite conservation concerns. Planning policy supports proposals where the design would be high quality, site specific and contemporary. It is these features that make the dormer acceptable.
- 6.12 Notwithstanding the fact that the plans do not show any pipes, a condition has been included to remove permitted development rights for these. This is to ensure that the scheme is delivered as designed, with no unwanted elements.
- 6.13 It is acknowledged that the double height window would not be similar in design or style to that of the existing building and that concerns have been raised in this regard. However, this window is considered to be an appropriate modern addition that would represent high quality design. Additionally, its visibility from the public realm would be limited due to the location of the building's rear projection.
- 6.14 The use of grey windows to the rear of the dwelling is considered acceptable as it would be an improvement on the existing uPVC casement window, and would match the colour of the new full height window and rear roof extension.
- 6.15 With regard to the rear extension, due to the high (2.8m) rear and side boundary wall, it would be barely visible from the public realm and its presence would thus have little effect on either the distinctive appearance of the host building or the character of the conservation area, particularly given that it would only project past the original building by 1.1m to the rear and by 0.9m to the side. Further, the existing rear lean-to has a maximum height of 3.2m, sloping down to 2.7m at the eaves. Therefore, despite the increase in depth, the proposed extension would be lower in height than the existing lean-to.
- 6.16 The proposal would result in the loss of the original bay window. The bay window is not a feature that is visible from the public realm and is therefore not considered to be one that makes a contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Given this, it is considered that the retention of the bay window would be an onerous requirement on the property owners in this instance.
- 6.17 It is proposed to use natural slate roof tiles in the reconstruction of the roof, rather than replace the brown concrete tiles that were on the roof prior to it collapsing. The lower roof to the original rear projection would also be re-tiled to match the main roof. This would enhance the appearance of the dwelling as compared to its previous state, as the concrete tiles are not original. The use of red and yellow stock brick for the rebuilding of the collapsed walls is also considered appropriate.
- 6.18 For the above reasons, officers consider that the proposal is acceptable as the proposal would be of high quality and there would not be an unacceptable level of impact on the character and appearance of the host building or conservation area, despite the objection received from the Lee Manor Society.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.19 Core Strategy Policy 15 states that extensions and adaptations to existing buildings will need to be designed to protect neighbour amenity.

- 6.20 It is noted that there have not been any objections from neighbouring properties to this proposal. Given that the rear extension would be 2.5m high and would be setback from the side boundary by 0.9m, it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on the adjoining property and this distance and the fact that there is a 2m boundary wall is considered sufficient to mitigate any impacts.
- 6.21 No new openings would be created by this proposal, with the exception of the double height window on the rear elevation. This would introduce some mutual overlooking, however it is considered that this would not be unreasonably adverse. This is due to the fact that there is an existing window at first floor level adjacent to the proposed double height window and that the latter would only increase the total width of the opening from 0.9m to 1.2m. No concerns are raised with regard to this window on the ground floor.
- 6.22 There would be potential for overlooking from the bedroom windows in the proposed rear roof extension into the rear gardens of the buildings adjacent to the subject site. However, it is acknowledged that some degree of overlooking is commonplace in a densely developed urban area such as this. The same is considered for the increase in light pollution that the proposed works could cause, and the proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this regard.
- 6.23 The proposal may have a minimal impact on the daylight and sunlight received by the dwellings to the east, as well as causing some overshadowing, however, given that the proposed extension would only be at ground floor and would only project past the original building by 1.1m, this is considered to be acceptable.

7.0 Equalities Considerations

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 In this matter there is no impact on equality.

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 and officers consider that the scheme is acceptable. This application is therefore recommended for approval.

9.0 **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:

219-PL-E-01, 219-PL-E-02 Rev A, 219-PL-E-03 Rev A, 219-PL-E-04 received 20 June 2016; 219-PL-P-01 Rev C, 219-PL-P-02 Rev D, 219-PL-P-03 Rev D, 219-PL-P-11, 219-PL-P-12, 219-PL-P-15, Photomontage 1, Photomontage 2, Design & Access Statement including Heritage Statement Rev C (31 August 2016, PlanStudio), Lewisham Planning Precedents (PlanStudio), VMZinc Facades Guidelines for Design and Specification, VMZinc Gallery 2016 Edition, VMZ Standing Seam Installation Guide January 2016 received 5 September 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) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no plumbing or pipes shall be fixed on the rear roofslope extension.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and to ensure that the scheme is delivered as designed and to accord 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).

- (4) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofed extension hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

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 and proactive discussions took place with the applicant prior to the application being submitted through a pre-application discussion. Following submission of the application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.