

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	10 BOWMAN's LEA	
Ward	Forest Hill	
Contributors	Catriona Morgan	
Class	PART 1	18 October 2018

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/18/106334
<u>Application dated</u>	15 March 2018 as revised 9 August 2018
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr O'Callaghan on behalf of Mr Nolan
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a single storey side and rear extension at 10 Bowman's Lea, SE23 together with the conversion of the garage into a habitable space, replacement of the front garage door with a window, replacement of first floor front elevation windows and alterations to the external landscaping.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	1706-PL-200; Design And Access Statement (NimTim Architects, 27th February 2018) received 4 th April 2018; 1706-PL-090 Rev D; 1706-PL-210 received 9th April 2018; 1706-PL-001 B; 1706-PL-100 B; 1706-PL-101 B; 1706-PL-102 B; 1706-PL-103 B; 1706-PL-300 B; 1706-PL-301 B; 1706-PL-302 B received 9 th August 2018.
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File LE/1064/10/TP (2) Local Development Framework Documents (3) The London Plan
<u>Designation</u>	PTAL 3 Not located in a Conservation Area No Article 4(2) Direction
<u>Screening</u>	N/A

1.0 Summary

1.1 This report sets out officer's recommendation in regard to the above proposal. The report has been brought before members for a decision as:

- Permission is recommended to be approved and:
 - there are 3 or more valid planning objections;
 - there are objections from recognised residents' association or community/amenity groups;

2.0 Property/Site Description

- 2.1 The application site comprises a three storey, end-terrace single family dwellinghouse located on the northern side of Bowman's Lea.
- 2.2 Bowman's Lea is a cul-de-sac located to the rear of Hengrave Road and Dunoon Road, with access off Dunoon Road. The cul-de-sac comprises ten terraced, three storey, single-family dwellinghouses with the external ground level of the site sloping downwards from No.1 to No.10. Each house within the cul-de-sac was originally built with a ground floor garage and vehicular door located on the front elevation of the building, and first floor Juliet balconies. The dwellinghouses are largely a mixture of yellow stock brick and timber cladding.
- 2.3 The subject site has a rear garden measuring approximately 22 metres in depth, which narrows towards the rear boundary of the plot. The external ground level in the rear garden significantly decreases from the flank wall of the application property towards Haredon Close, located to the south-east of the application site, and as such the application property sits approximately 2.7 metres higher than the three storey dwelling at No.1 Haredon Close.
- 2.4 The site has a PTAL rating of 3, based on a scale of 0-6b with 6b having the highest degree of accessibility to public transport. The site is not subject to any other particular designations.

3.0 Planning History

- 3.1 DC/18/106086 - A Lawful development Certificate (proposed) in respect to the conversion of the existing integral garage to a study, bricking up of the garage opening and the installation of a casement window in its place and the removal of two windows in the first floor rear elevation and their replacement with a large picture/casement window and the installation of a replacement window in the first floor front elevation at 10 Bowman's Lea, SE6 – Granted 25/04/2018.
- 3.2 DC/18/106081 - Lawful development Certificate (proposed) in respect to the construction of a single-storey ground floor rear extension and a side extension at 10 Bowman's Lea, SE6 – Granted 25/04/2018.
- 3.3 DC/17/104520 - The construction of a single storey side and rear extension at 10 Bowman's Lea, SE23, together with the conversion of the garage into a habitable space, replacement of the front garage door with a window, replacement of first floor juliet balcony with windows, replacement of first floor rear windows with one window and insertion of a ground floor window in the flank elevation – Refused 22/01/2018.
- 3.4 The application was refused for the following reasons:
- The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its siting, height and materials, would constitute an incongruous and overdominant form of development that would be detrimental to the character of the host dwelling and would not appear as a subordinate addition, contrary to Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character and DM Policy 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) and Lewisham's Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).

- The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its overall height and scale, would result in unacceptable overbearing impact and increased sense of enclosure on the amenities of No.9 Bowman's Lea and, to a lesser extent, No.1 Haredon Close, contrary to 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) and the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006 updated May 2012).
- The proposed first floor front and rear fenestration alterations, by reason of their detailed design, would constitute an incongruous form of development that would be detrimental to the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area, contrary to Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character and DM Policy 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) and Lewisham's Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).

3.5 The subsequent appeal to the Planning Inspectorate was dismissed, although the Inspector acknowledges in Paragraph 11 that,

3.6 *“The extension would be appropriately subordinate to the host dwelling as a whole and second, subject to the imposition of a planning condition in relation to the (rentention of the) Juliette balcony on a potential planning permission, the proposed changes in fenestration would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the terrace of properties.”*

3.7 Notwithstanding the above, the Inspector considered in Paragraph 6 that, *“The proposal would be detrimental to the outlook from No.9’s ground floor openings and from the rear garden closest to the dwelling. There would be an undue sense of enclosure.”* Furthermore in Paragraph 7, the Inspector considered that, *“There would be an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of both No.s 1 and 2 (and to a lesser extent No.3) Haredon Close owing to views from the proposed side elevation window in the proposed extension.”*

4.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposal

4.1 This application relates to the construction of a single storey side and rear extension, together with the conversion of the garage into a habitable space, replacement of the front garage door with a window, replacement of the first floor front elevation windows, and alterations to the external landscaping.

4.2 The side and rear extension would measure approximately 5.76 metres in depth, to incorporate a 3 metre projection from the rear elevation. The development would extend approximately 2.6 metres from the flank elevation of the property, and would extend a maximum 7.67 metres in width at the rear. The extension would have a flat roof measuring approximately 2.97 metres in height. A parapet wall would surround the extension measuring approximately 0.2 metres in height. The extension would have glazed patio doors and two full length windows in the rear elevation, and a door in the front elevation. The walls of the extension would be render with a sedum roof.

- 4.3 On the front elevation of the application property, the replacement of the front garage door with a window would comprise bricks to match existing and a window similar in appearance to the existing. The windows would be aluminium framed.
- 4.4 The application also proposes to level off the part of the ground level of the rear garden, so that it is increased by approximately 0.2 metres in height.

Additional Information

- 4.5 The application initially proposed a window on the flank elevation of the building, and a window in the flank elevation of the extension. However, revised drawings were submitted detailing that these windows have now been removed from the proposal. The applicants have also confirmed that the proposed extension would be no greater than 3 metres in height from the proposed external ground level.

5.0 Consultation

- 5.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. Following the submission of the amended documents, a further neighbour consultation was carried out, the responses are also summarised below. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 5.2 A site notice was displayed and letters were sent to nine residents and business in the surrounding area, as well as the relevant ward Councillors in Forest Hill.
- 5.3 Five neighbouring properties initially raised objection to the proposal.

Written Responses received from Local Residents Following Post-Submission Consultation

- 5.4 The planning concerns raised by neighbouring residents are summarised below:
- The proposed extension would have a serious impact upon daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residents;
 - The close proximity and height of the proposed extension would create a sense of enclosure to immediately neighbouring homes and gardens;
 - The first floor front elevation replacement windows will be an untidy mix of clear and frosted glass necessitated because of the siting of a bathroom at the front of the house, and as a result will compromise the architectural integrity and attractiveness of the whole terrace;
 - The loss of visual amenity to houses in the immediate vicinity created by the compromising of the relatively open character of the area at the lower end of Bowman's Lea;
 - The green roof proposed is completely out of character with the design of the buildings in this area;
 - The proposed windows and door on the side elevation of the application property and extension would create intrusive overlooking of the properties in Haredon Close.

5.5 Following the submission of amended drawings and re-consultation, four neighbouring properties raised objection to the proposal.

Written Responses received from Local Residents Following Submission of Amended Plans

5.6 The planning concerns raised by neighbouring residents are summarised below:

- The proposed extension would have a serious impact upon daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residents;
- The close proximity and height of the proposed extension would create a sense of enclosure to immediately neighbouring homes and gardens;
- The first floor front elevation replacement windows will be an untidy mix of clear and frosted glass necessitated because of the siting of a bathroom at the front of the house, and as a result will compromise the architectural integrity and attractiveness of the whole terrace;
- The loss of visual amenity to houses in the immediate vicinity created by the compromising of the relatively open character of the area at the lower end of Bowman's Lea, and the rear extension will also be over dominant and greatly out of character with all other adjacent properties;
- The proposed door on the front elevation of the extension would create intrusive overlooking of the properties in Haredon Close.

6.0 Policy Context

Introduction

6.1 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.

6.2 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 (NPPF) 2018

6.3 The revised NPPF, originally published in 2012, was published on 24th July 2018 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning and related applications.

- 6.4 It contains at paragraph 11, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on its implementation. In summary, this states in paragraph 213, 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 and in regard to existing local policies, that '...due weight should be given to them, 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)'.
- 6.5 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy and Development Management Local Plan 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

- 6.6 The DCLG launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) resource on the 6th March 2014. This replaced a number of planning practice guidance documents.

The Development Plan

- 6.7 The London Plan, Lewisham's Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations DPD, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan and the Development Management Local Plan and together constitute the borough's Development Plan.

London Plan (March 2016)

- 6.8 The London Plan was updated on the 14 March 2016 to incorporate Housing Standards and Parking Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan (2015). The new, draft London Plan was published by the Mayor of London for public consultation on 29 November 2017 (until 2 March 2018). However, given the very early stage in this process, this document has very limited weight as a material consideration when determining planning applications, and does not warrant a departure from the existing policies of the development plan in this instance and is therefore not referred to in this report. The policies in the current adopted London Plan (2016) relevant to this application are:

Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture

Core Strategy (June 2011)

- 6.9 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 (November 2014)

- 6.10 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 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 31	Alterations/extensions to existing buildings

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2006, updated 2012)

- 6.11 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.
- 6.12 Paragraph 6.2 (Rear Extensions) of the SPD states that when considering applications for extensions the Council will look at these main issues:
- How the extension relates to the house;
 - The effect on the character of the area - the street scene and the wider area;
 - The physical impact on the host building, and the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties;
 - A suitably sized garden should be maintained.
- 6.13 Paragraph 6.3 (Materials) states that bricks and roofing material used to construct an extension should match those in the original building. However, the use of modern materials is supported where appropriate.
- 6.14 Paragraph 6.4 (Bulk and size) states that extensions should be smaller and less bulky than the original building and reflect its form and shape. It states that traditionally, extensions to buildings are subsidiary to the main structure and that over-dominant extensions may destroy the architectural integrity of existing buildings.
- 6.15 Paragraph 6.5 (Side Extensions) of the SPD states that in order to ensure that a side extension appears subsidiary to the main building a set back may be used which should be followed through to the roof which should be similarly set back. The set back should be at least 300mm, but the depth might need to vary considerably dependent of the nature of the urban form of the street. The depth of the set back will depend on how prominent the building is, its location, the design of the surrounding buildings, and the character and rhythm of the street as set by distances between buildings.

7.0 Planning Considerations

- 7.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are design and impact of the proposal upon neighbouring residential amenity.

Design

- 7.2 Urban design is a key consideration in the planning process. The NPPF makes it clear that national government places great importance on the design of the built

environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

- 7.3 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. In addition to this, paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 7.4 In relation to Lewisham, Core Strategy Policy 15 outlines how 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.
- 7.5 DM Policy 30 requires planning applications to demonstrate a site specific response which creates a positive relationship with the existing townscape whereby the height, scale and mass of the proposed development relates to the urban typology of the area.
- 7.6 DM Policy 31 requires development proposals for alterations to be of a high, site specific and sensitive design quality and to respect and/or compliment the form, setting period, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys and porches. High quality matching or complimentary materials should be usedm appropriately and sensitively in relation to context.

Single Storey Side and Rear Extension

- 7.7 The subject site has a rear garden measuring approximately 22 metres in depth, which narrows towards the rear boundary of the plot. The extension would project 3 metres further than the existing rear elevation of the property. Therefore it is considered that the rear garden can absorb the impact of the proposed extension whilst maintaining adequate amenity space for the occupants. The extension would be set back from the front elevation of the application property by approximately 5.92 metres and the footprint of the proposed development is considered to be proportionate to the host dwelling.
- 7.8 It is acknowledged that the Residential Standards SPD states that extensions should be smaller and less bulky than the original building. The height of the proposal has been reduced by approximately 0.2 metres from the previous submission and in the decision notice for the dismissed appeal of that application, the Planning Inspectorate considered that, *“The extension would be appropriately subordinate to the host dwelling as a whole”*. On balance, and given the proportions of the existing property as a three-storey building, the scale of the extension is considered to be acceptable.

- 7.9 The application proposes that the walls of the extension would be a textured render, and the development would have a sedum roof. These details are considered to be acceptable.

Replacement of Front Garage Door With Window

- 7.10 The proposed ground floor window in the front elevation of the property would replace an existing garage door. The window would be similar in appearance to those in the existing property, and the rest of the opening will be infilled with bricks to match the existing. As such, this alteration is considered to be acceptable.

Replacement of First Floor Front Elevation Windows

- 7.11 The proposed first floor windows in the front elevation of the property would replace existing French doors. One of these first floor windows would serve an ensuite, however the proposed front elevation indicates that the window would not be obscurely glazed. The proposed replacement windows are considered to be acceptable.
- 7.12 In light of the above the proposed single storey side and rear extension and alterations to the fenestration are considered to be acceptable with regard to design, and would be in accordance with Policies DM 30 and DM 31 of the Development Management Plan.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 7.13 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 alterations should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity to adjoining houses and their back gardens. It must therefore be demonstrated that proposed alterations are neighbourly and that significant harm will not arise with respect to overbearing impact, overshadowing, and loss of light, loss of outlook or general noise and disturbance.
- 7.14 The main properties to consider in an assessment of the impacts of the proposal upon residential amenities are No.9 Bowman's Lea, and No.1 and No.2 Haredon Close.

No.9 Bowman's Lea

- 7.15 The proposed extension would be built up to the shared boundary with No.9 Bowman's Lea and would project 3 metres further than the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. The extension would have a flat roof with parapet surround measuring approximately 3 metres in height from the external ground level at No.9. There are double doors in the rear elevation of No.9, which lead out to the relatively narrow rear garden. The rear elevation of No.9 is also set back from the rear elevation of adjoining No.7 Bowman's Lea.
- 7.16 A Lawful Development Certificate was approved on 25th April 2018 (ref. 18/106081) for the construction of a single storey rear extension, and a single storey side extension at the application site. The single storey rear extension proposed in this application is of a similar height and depth to the current proposal, and can be constructed under permitted development and without

planning permission. This is taken as the fallback development and is a material consideration in the assessment of the current application.

- 7.17 In the appeal decision of dismissed application DC/17/104520, where the proposed rear extension was of a similar depth to the current proposal but measured 3.2 metres in height, the Inspector states that, *“I have borne in mind that the fallback development would be a similar height and depth but, with regard to height in particular, it would be lower and even though the difference is small it is an important margin given the characteristics of the current outlook from no.9.”*
- 7.18 With regards to overshadowing from the development to the neighbouring property, No.9, Officers have carried out all conclusive tests and sequential sunlight/daylight assessments in accordance with BRE guidance. The proposed development would not result in any material loss of natural light. The impact of overshadowing is therefore considered de minimis.

Officers need advise members, that the development proposal does partially benefit from a fallback position of previously having approval for a development proposal, this is with reference to projected depth and height which are identical, the width however differs which is why planning permission is required. The development proposal abuts the boundary wall of No.9, notwithstanding this by virtue of its projected height, depth and siting there is no overbearing impact against the primary/habitable windows served by No.9.

No. 1 and No.2 Haredon Close

- 7.19 The proposed extension would be set back from the shared boundary with No.1 Haredon Close by approximately 1.16 metres, and would be set back from the rear elevations of No.1 and No.2 Haredon Close by at least 9 metres. The external ground level significantly decreases from Bowman's Lea towards Haredon Close, and as such the application property sits considerably higher than the neighbouring three storey dwellings. The current proposal is set away from the neighbouring boundary fence by approximately 2 metres
- 7.20 In the appeal decision of dismissed application DC/17/104520, the Inspector considered that the proposal would be sufficiently distant to not cause a sense of enclosure to the occupants of No.1 and No.2. Given the differing ground levels between the two properties and the height of the proposed extension, Officers consider that the development would not be overbearing or result in an increased sense of enclosure for the occupants of No.1 and No.2 Haredon Close.
- 7.21 The application originally proposed a window on the flank elevation of the building, and a window in the flank elevation of the extension. However, revised drawings were submitted detailing that these windows have now been removed from the proposal. The application proposes a glazed door in the front elevation of the extension. This door would not directly face into the rear garden of No.1 Haredon Close and as such, is not considered to result in overlooking or a loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants.
- 7.22 In light of the above the proposed single storey side and rear extension is not considered to harm the living conditions of the occupants of No.9 Bowman's Lea or No.s 1 and 2 Haredon Close, and would be in accordance with Policy DM 31 of the Development Management Plan.

Highways

- 7.23 In light of the impact on the existing parking provisions of the site, the proposed site layout would still retain parking facilities for one vehicle with no overhang, therefore the proposal adheres to Core Strategy Policy 14.

8.0 Equalities Considerations

- 8.1 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.
- 8.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 8.3 The planning issues set out above do not include any factors that relate specifically to any of the equalities categories set out in the Act, and therefore it has been concluded that there is no impact on equality.

8.0 Human Rights Implications

- 8.1 In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 prohibits authorities (including the Council as local planning authority) from acting in a way which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. “Convention” here means the European Convention on Human Rights, certain parts of which were incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998. Various Convention rights are likely to be relevant including:
- Right to a fair trial
 - Respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence
 - Freedom of expression
 - Freedom of thought, belief and religion
 - Freedom of expression
 - Freedom of assembly and association
- 8.2 This report has outlined the consultation that has been undertaken on the planning application and the opportunities for people to make representations to the Council as Local Planning Authority.
- 8.3 Members need to satisfy themselves that the potential adverse amenity impacts are acceptable and that any potential interference with Article 8 rights will be legitimate and justified. Both public and private interests are to be taken into account in the exercise of the Local Planning Authority’s powers and duties. Any

interference with a Convention right must be necessary and proportionate. Members must therefore, carefully consider the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest.

- 8.4 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a new residential extension. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including including respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations, and it is considered that the application complies with all such policies.
- 9.2 The proposed extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of design, and would project no significant harmful impacts upon the host property or wider area. Moreover it would not harm the amenities of adjoining and neighbouring occupiers.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

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:

1706-PL-200; Design And Access Statement (NimTim Architects, 27th February 2018) received 4th April 2018;

1706-PL-090 Rev D; 1706-PL-210 received 9th April 2018;

1706-PL-001 B; 1706-PL-100 B; 1706-PL-101 B; 1706-PL-102 B; 1706-PL-103 B; 1706-PL-300 B; 1706-PL-301 B; 1706-PL-302 B received 9th August 2018.

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 No extensions or alterations to the building(s) hereby approved, whether or not permitted under Article 3 to Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) of that Order, shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

Reason: In order that, in view of the nature of the development hereby permitted, the local planning authority may have the opportunity of assessing the impact of any further development and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

- 4 The flat roofed areas from the proposed single storey side/rear extension hereby permitted shall at no time be used as a terrace or walking platform.

Reason: To avoid the direct overlooking of adjoining properties and consequent loss of privacy thereto and to comply with DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

- 5 No development shall commence on site until a detailed schedule and specification/samples of all external materials and finishes to be used on the extension hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building(s) and to comply with Policy 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

- A. You are advised that this permission relates only to the proposed construction of an extension to the existing dwellinghouse and that any sub-division of the dwellinghouse would require planning permission.
- B. 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.