

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	18 Bolden Street, SE8	
Ward	Brockley	
Contributors	Alfie Williams	
Class	PART 1	24th January 2019

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/18/109040
<u>Application dated</u>	24.09.18
<u>Applicant</u>	Mr J Neate
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a mansard roof extension at 18 Bolden Street, SE8.
<u>Plan Nos</u>	G191_100; G191_101; G191_120; G191_121; G191_122; G191_123; G191_130; G191_131; G191_132; G191_140; G191_141; G191_220 Rev A; G191_221 Rev A; G191_222 Rev A; G191_300 Rev A; G191_301 Rev A; G191_400 Rev A; G191_401 Rev A; G191_402 Rev A; G191_403 Rev A; Design And Access Statement;
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File DE/120/18 (2) Core Strategy (June 2011) (3) Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) (4) The London Plan (March 2016)
<u>Designation</u>	Brookmill Road Conservation Area Brookmill Road Article 4 Direction Deptford Neighbourhood Forum Area of Archaeological Priority PTAL 4

## 1.0 Summary

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 refused and:
  - a local Ward Councillor requested that the matter be dealt with by planning committee, which was agreed by the Head of Planning.

## **2.0 Property/Site Description**

- 2.1 The application relates to a two-storey mid terrace Victorian dwellinghouse located on the south-eastern side of Bolden Street at the junction with Albyn Road. The property's front elevation houses two large timber sash windows with marginal glazing arrangements at first floor level and another of the same design at ground floor and a timber front door.
- 2.2 The application property sits in a short terrace of four properties within a predominately-residential area on an easterly sloping road. Properties on the road repeat the pattern of four terraced properties with the end properties hosting a canted bay window and a narrow front garden. Properties on Bolden Street are characterised by London roofs concealed behind a parapet wall on the front façade, and two storey rear outriggers.
- 2.3 The property is within the Brookmill Road Conservation Area and subject to the Brookmill Conservation Area Article 4 Direction, which restricts permitted development rights for development which would front a highway, waterway or open space. The property is not listed nor is it in the vicinity of a listed property.

## **3.0 Planning History**

### Planning history at 18 Bolden Street

- 3.1 DC/18/106386: The construction of a single storey infill rear extension 18 Bolden Street SE8 – planning permission was granted 14 May 2018.
- 3.2 DC/18/107948: The excavation at basement level and provision of a rear lightwell to provide additional habitable floorspace at 18 Bolden Street SE8, together with the construction of a single storey extension to the rear, the installation of a replacement front gate and landscaping to the front garden – planning permission granted 28 August 2018.

### Other relevant planning history

- 3.3 DC/16/97644: The construction of a mansard roof extension with two dormer windows to the front roofslope and two dormers to the rear at 13 Bolden Street, SE8 – refused and dismissed on appeal for the following reasons.
- 3.4 *The proposed mansard roof extension, by reason of its height, detailed design and materials would be an incongruous, unsympathetic and visually intrusive addition harmful to the historic design conventions of the host property and the character and appearance of the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 7.4 Local character, 7.6 Architecture and 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology of the London Plan (March 2016), Policies 15 High quality design for Lewisham and 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policies 30 Urban design and local character, 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and 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 of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) and paragraph 6.7 of the Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).*

- 3.5 *The proposed mansard roof extension would result in the loss of the historic roof form to the detriment of the character of the host property, the historic and cohesive nature of the immediate terrace of which it forms part, Bolden Street and the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. As such it would be contrary to Policies 7.4 Local character, 7.6 Architecture and 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology of the London Plan (March 2016), Policies 15 High quality design for Lewisham and 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policies 30 Urban design and local character, 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and 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 of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) and paragraph 6.7 of the Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).*
- 3.6 *In dismissing the appeal the Inspector concluded ‘that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the appeal property, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. It would conflict with the strategic design and conservation aims of Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011, and DM Policy 30, and with the more detailed design criteria set out in DM Policies 36 and 31, and the SPD. For the same reasons, it would not accord with the strategic and specific aims of Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of The London Plan 2016. Having regard to Section 12 of the Framework, I find that this proposal would harm the significance of the designated heritage asset, and this harm would not be outweighed by public benefits.’*
- 3.7 DC/16/95824: The construction of a mansard roof extension together with the installation of two windows to the front and rear roofslopes at 40 St John's Vale, SE8 - refused 13 September 2016 and dismissed on appeal 30 December 2016
- 3.8 DC/16/95825: The construction of a mansard roof extension together with the installation of two dormer windows to the front roofslope and two to the rear at 38 St John's Vale, SE8 – refused 13 September 2016 and dismissed on appeal 17 January 2016.
- 3.9 DC/09/71091: The construction of a mansard roof extension, incorporating two dormer windows to the front roof slope of 140 Albyn Road SE8 – granted by Committee 17 July 2009.
- 3.10 DC/11/77273: The construction of a mansard roof extension, incorporating two dormer windows to the front and rear roof slopes of 6 Bolden Street SE8 – granted 22 July 2011.

#### **4.0 Background**

- 4.1 The character and appearance of the Brookmill Conservation Area is made up of modest, 2-storey originally working and lower middle class houses built mainly between 1850 and 1870. Houses are usually grouped in short terraces of four, six or eight in which the single house forms a unit within a larger entity. Despite some differences in elevational treatment of the terraces, the character of the area is one of great architectural unity with the occasional accent at a street corner.

- 4.2 Number 18 Bolden Street forms part of a stepped Victorian set of terraced houses, which step up towards Albyn Road. The houses are constructed from yellow stock brick under its original slate 'London' or 'butterfly' roof with flank walls and chimney stacks. The butterfly roof is very typical of this terrace and was used extensively in the 19th century on terraced houses, which can be found throughout this conservation area. The roof has been concealed behind the front façade by a parapet obscuring the two gables and the gutter, whereas the rear has been left visible allowing the 'V' shape to remain visible forming an attractive pattern to the back of the terraces. A pronounced dentillated corniced parapet runs over the full length of the terrace and finishes the façades towards the sky.
- 4.3 The intended consistent architectural features and undisturbed roofline to this terrace and the replica terrace facing it create a strong group value, and form part of an architectural composition within this group of buildings, the local street scene and the wider roofscape of the conservation area.
- 4.4 Mansard roofs have been granted planning permission and built within the Brookmill Road Conservation Area, on Albyn Road and Lind Street, with an unimplemented permission at 6 Bolden Street (reference DC/11/77273) dating from 2011. The permissions setting the precedent on Albyn Road date from 2009 and as such pre-date the current local plan. Due to the unimplemented permission at no.6, Bolden Street has remained one of the roads within the Conservation Area without roof extensions, and the Council have successfully resisted subsequent applications for mansard roof extensions on the road. As such, Bolden Street is regarded as an important surviving example of the appearance, character and continuity of streets within the wider Conservation Area.
- 4.5 The appeal dismissed (ref. APP/C5690/D/16/3162236) in January 2017 for the application for a mansard roof extension at 13 Bolden Street is the most relevant to this application (Council ref DC/16/097644). The inspector acknowledged the presence of other mansard roof extensions in the Conservation Area on Albyn Road and Lind street, however because the dwellings on Bolden Street retain their original and distinctive roofscape, the inspector considered that the unaltered houses on Bolden Street makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The inspector concluded that *'in this case, the set-back, traditional design and matching materials of the extension would not mitigate the adverse visual impact on the dwelling, the street scene and the wider conservation area'*.
- 4.6 There are also two further relevant decisions dismissing appeals for mansard roof extensions elsewhere in the Brookmill Road Conservation Area at 38 St John's Vale (ref. APP/C5690/D/16/3160036) and 40 St John's Vale (ref. APP/C5690/D/16/3159477).
- 4.7 The policy context for the appeals at 13 Bolden Street and 38 and 40 St John's Vale is largely the same, with the exception that the applications and appeals at St John's Vale would have been determined in the context of the old NPPF, whereas this application must be determined under the new NPPF 2018. However, the section relating to the historic environment is not considered to be substantially different to the previous version.

## 5.0 Current Planning Applications

### The Proposal

- 5.1 The construction of a mansard roof extension measuring 1.9m in height with a depth of 7m and width of 4.9m. The mansard would be clad in slate and would be flanked by stock brick parapet walls measuring 3m in height. The mansard would feature two dormers in both the front and rear roof slopes. The dormers would be clad in lead and would house timber sliding sash windows to match the existing.
- 5.2 The mansard would be set back from the front parapet by 0.3m and would project 1.5m above the height of the front parapet. The flank walls would project 2m above the front parapet. The butterfly roof form would be retained to the rear and the original chimney retained and raised in height.

## 6.0 Consultation

- 6.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 6.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors. The St John's Society were also consulted.

### Written Responses received from Local Residents

- 6.3 Two objections and seven comments of support were received from local residents.
- 6.4 The comments in support raised the following points.

Precedent with the Conservation Area	Paras 4.4 - 4.6 and 8.8
Allows families to extend homes and stay in the area	Para 8.10
Good design quality – not harmful the conservation area	Paras 4.4 - 4.6, 8.5 – 8.7 and 8.9
Butterfly roofs are difficult to insulate	Para 8.10
Large development in the skyline – St James One SE8, Conington Rd	Para 8.8

- 6.5 A local ward councillor also commented in support of the application commenting that Bolden Street should be considered in the immediate context of Albyn Street and Lind Street, which have a proliferation of mansard roof extensions, and therefore the principle of preserving the roofscape on Bolden Street is not applicable.

6.6 The objections to the application state that the introduction of a mansard roof would fail to preserve and enhance the Brookmill Road Conservation Area, due to the uninterrupted roofscape on Bolden Street and would therefore be contrary to policy. A concern was also raised regarding social cohesion, noting homeowners would be more likely to be able to extend their homes than renters.

## **7.0 Policy Context**

### Introduction

7.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

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

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018

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

7.4 It contains at paragraph 11, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the revised 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 revised 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)'.

7.5 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy and Development Management Local Plan for consistency with the revised 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 213 of the revised NPPF.

### National Planning Practice Guidance 'NPPG' (2014 onwards)

7.6 On 6th March 2014, DCLG launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) resource. This replaced a number of planning practice guidance documents, and is subject to continuous periodical updates in difference subject areas

## The Development Plan

- 7.7 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)

- 7.8 The Mayor of London published a draft London Plan on 29 November 2017. Minor modifications before the EIP were published on 13 August. As such, this document now has some limited weight as a material consideration when determining planning applications. The relevant draft policies are listed below and discussed within the report. These are limited to policies that are materially different to existing London Plan policies.
- 7.9 The policies in the current adopted London Plan (2016) relevant to this application are:

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

The emerging London Plan policies relevant to this application are:

D1 London's form and characteristics  
HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

### Core Strategy (June 2011)

- 7.10 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 5 Areas of Stability and Managed Change  
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 (November 2014)

- 7.11 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:
- 7.12 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 (2006, updated 2012)

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

## **8.0 Planning Considerations**

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

- Design & Conservation
- Impact on Adjoining Properties

### Design & Conservation

- 8.2 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that (in summary) with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, the Council is required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that conservation area.
- 8.3 Chapter 16 of the revised NPPF relates to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The principles and policies set out in Chapter 16 apply to the heritage-related consent regimes for which local planning authorities are responsible under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as to plan-making, decision-taking and design.
- 8.4 DM Policy 36 requires all extensions to be compatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.
- 8.5 The proposed mansard extension would project 1.5m above the level of the front parapet and as such would form a prominent part of the streetscene. The additional height of the flank parapet walls and chimney and topography of the road would further add to the prominence of the extension. Officers consider that the proposed mansard roof would appear bulky relative to the original house, and disruptive to the cohesion of the roofscape and wider streetscene. This is clearly contrary to DM Policy 31, which states that roof extensions on the street frontage of a building, particularly in a residential street will be resisted in favour of extensions to the rear of the building.
- 8.6 The application refused and dismissed on appeal for a mansard roof extension at 13 Bolden Street is considered to be relevant to the present application given it relates to a mansard roof extension of similar design, massing and materiality proposed at an architecturally similar property located on the same road. In dismissing the appeal at no.13 the inspector stated that “the impact would conflict with DM Policy 31 of the Council’s Development Management Local Plan 2014 (DM), which seeks to resist roof extensions on the street frontage of a building, and extensions which would adversely affect the architectural integrity of a group of buildings as a whole”. It should also be noted that the proposed mansard at no.13 was set back further from the front parapet, and would therefore be less

harmful, than the mansard in the current application. The Inspector found that the mansard at no. 13 Bolden Street would have an adverse visual impact on the dwelling, streetscene and Conservation Area. The current proposal would be more harmful and officers consider that the proposed development would be visually intrusive and contrary to DM Policy 31.

- 8.7 The mansard roof extension would be constructed from matching materials. However, the historically appropriate materials are not considered to mitigate the harmful visual bulk of the extension.
- 8.8 It is acknowledged that there are sixteen properties on Albyn Road and three properties on Lind Street, that have implemented planning permissions for mansard roof extensions, in addition to larger developments located to the north and south of the Conservation Area. However, the original roofline of Bolden Street survived unaltered. The Council have been consistent in resisting mansard roof extensions on roads within the Brookmill Road Conservation Area that have an unaltered roofscape. As noted in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 the Council's position on mansard extensions within the Brookmill Road Conservation Area has been supported at appeal. At 13 Bolden Street, the Inspector concludes that '*its largely unaltered roofscape is nevertheless an important example of the appearance, character and continuity of the historic street*'.
- 8.9 The Council has a duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. The proposed mansard roof extension is not considered compatible with the scale, form or special characteristics of the Conservation Area and as such is considered harmful to the character of the Brookmill Road Conservation Area and therefore contrary to DM Policy 36.
- 8.10 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that 'harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. The provision of additional living accommodation is not considered to constitute a public benefit sufficient to justify the harmful impacts of the proposed development. It is also worth noting that the Council granted planning permission in August 2018 for the extension of the property at basement level and to the rear to create approximately 81sqm of habitable floorspace. It is recognised that butterfly roofs are difficult to insulate. However, it is possible to do so in a less intrusive way than constructing a large roof extension.
- 8.11 The proposed roof extension would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Brookmill Road Conservation Area resulting in considerable visual harm to the roofscape of Bolden Street. The proposed development is therefore contrary to DM Policies 30, 31 and 36.

#### Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 8.12 DM Policy 31 states that residential development should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity (including sunlight and daylight) to adjoining houses and their back gardens.
- 8.13 The proposed mansard roof extension would not extend beyond the footprint of the existing roof and, given the proposed height, is therefore unlikely to have a significant impact on light levels to neighbouring properties. In addition, the proposal would not introduce windows closer to neighbouring properties than the

existing windows on lower floors and as such would not result in a perceptible loss of privacy.

- 8.14 The application is deemed acceptable in terms of residential amenity in accordance with DM Policy 31.

## **9.0 Local Finance Considerations**

- 9.1 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), 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).
- 9.2 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.
- 9.3 The applicant has completed the relevant form however; CIL is not payable on this application.

## **10.0 Equalities Considerations**

- 10.1 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 10.2 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to:
- (a) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
  - (b) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
  - (c) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 10.3 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.
- 10.4 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but

nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/technical-guidance-public-sector-equality-duty-england>

- 10.5 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
  2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
  3. Engagement and the equality duty
  4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
  5. Equality information and the equality duty
- 10.6 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty-guidance>
- 10.7 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 on equality.

## **11.0 Human Rights Implications**

- 10.1 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
  - Peaceful enjoyment of one's property
- 10.2 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.
- 10.3 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.

## **12.0 CONCLUSION**

- 11.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 11.2 The proposed mansard roof extension would form an incongruous, visually intrusive addition to the streetscene resulting in a harmful visual impact, failing to preserve or enhance the character of the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies 15 and 16 of the Core Strategy and DM policies 30, 31 and 36.

## **13.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSE PERMISSION** for the following reason:-

- 1) The proposed mansard roof extension, by reason of its height and design would form an incongruous, unsympathetic and visually intrusive addition to the streetscene, resulting in the loss of the historic roof form to the detriment of the character of the host property and, the historic and cohesive nature of the immediate terrace of which it forms part, Bolden Street and the Brookmill Road Conservation Area. As such it would be contrary to Policies 7.4 Local character, 7.6 Architecture and 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology of the London Plan (March 2016), Policies 15 High quality design for Lewisham and 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policies 30 Urban design and local character, 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and 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 of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) and paragraph 6.7 of the Residential Standards SPD (updated May 2012).

## **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, no pre-application advice was sought before the application was submitted. As the proposal was clearly contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan, it was considered that further discussions would be unnecessary and costly for all parties.