



## Planning Committee A

**Report title: 36 GELLATLY ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5TT**

**Date:** 6 January 2022

**Key decision:** No.

**Class:** Part 1

**Ward(s) affected:** Telegraph Hill

**Contributors:** Max Curson

### Outline and recommendations

*This report sets out the Officer's recommendation of approval for the above proposal. The application has been brought before Committee for a decision as the Telegraph Hill Society have objected to the proposal.*

## Application details

**Application reference number(s):** DC/21/123044

**Application Date:** 11 August 2021

**Applicant:** Egan Architects on behalf of Mr Pyke

**Proposal:** Construction of a single storey infill extension at the rear of 36 Gellatly Road, SE14, together with the demolition of the existing rear extension, insertion of rooflights to the outrigger roof slopes, and installation of replacement timber sash windows at the front and rear elevation and replacement of the slate roof tiles.

**Background Papers:** (1) Submission drawings  
(2) Submission technical reports and documents  
(3) Statutory consultee responses

**Designation:** PTAL 3  
Area of Archaeological Priority  
Telegraph Hill Conservation Area  
Telegraph Hill Article 4(2) Direction

**Screening:** N/A

## 1 SITE AND CONTEXT

### *Site description and current use*

- 1 The application site is a two storey mid-terrace single family dwellinghouse located on the western side of Gellatly Road.
- 2 There was no site visit for the application due to travel restrictions related to the Covid-19 global pandemic. The site photos provided by the applicant, aerial and recent images available on Streetview and Google Earth are considered to be a sufficient basis to make an informed recommendation.

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



**Figure 1: Site Location Plan**

***Character of area***

- 3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and characterised by terraces of two storey Victorian dwellings.
- 4 The application site lies within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area and is subject to an Article 4 Direction. It is not a listed building nor in the vicinity of one. It is located in an area of Archaeological Priority. The property is identified as a non-designated heritage assets as a positive contributor to the wider conservation area.

***Surrounding area***

- 5 Hollydale Primary School is located approximately 180m to the south-west of the application site. There are a number of shops, takeaways and public houses within a 250m radius.

***Local environment***

- 6 The site falls within Air Quality Management Area.

***Transport***

- 7 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 3 on a scale of 1-6b, 1 being lowest and 6b the highest.
- 8 Nunhead Railway Station is located approximately 250m to the south-west of the application site.

**Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

## 2 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

9 There is no planning history for the application site.

## 3 CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATION

### 3.1 THE PROPOSALS

10 Construction of a single storey infill extension at the rear of 36 Gellatly Road, SE14, together with the demolition of the existing rear extension, insertion of rooflights to the rear roof slope and outrigger roof slope, and installation of replacement timber sash windows at the front and rear elevation and replacement of the slate roof tiles.



Figure 2: existing (left) and proposed (right) rear elevation

11 During the application process and in response to consultation, the boundary height of the proposed extension was reduced to 2.5m when measured from the ground level of No.38.

### Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

## 4 CONSULTATION

### 4.1 PRE-APPLICATION ENGAGEMENT

12 No pre-application advice was sought from the council regarding the proposal.

### 4.2 APPLICATION PUBLICITY

13 Site notices were displayed on 23 August 2021 and a press notice was published on 25 August 2021.

14 Letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors on 17 August 2021.

15 The Telegraph Hill Society objected to the application. A summary of the Society's objection is set out in the table below.

Comment	Para where addressed
Loss of the side bay window and original fabric of the host property.	49-52
The proposal would create a wind tunnel for the rear access of the neighbouring property (38 Gellatly Road).	63
It would reduce the levels of light and available to the side windows in the neighbouring outrigger.	61, 62
The skylight on the proposed extension would lead to light pollution and impact the amenity of the neighbours.	64
The height of the extension is larger than the guidelines set out in the Alterations and Extensions SPD.	37
The design of the proposal does not respect the host building.	38
The extension will give rise to a visually plain façade to No 38.	37

### 4.3 INTERNAL CONSULTATION

16 The following internal consultees were notified on 16 August 2021:

17 Conservation: reviewed and no comment to make.

### 4.4 EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

18 No external consultees were notified given the nature of the application.

#### Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

## **5 POLICY CONTEXT**

### **5.1 LEGISLATION**

19 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (S38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 Town & Country Planning Act 1990).

20 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990: S.66/S.72 gives the LPA special duties in respect of heritage assets.

### **5.2 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

21 A material consideration is anything that, if taken into account, creates the real possibility that a decision-maker would reach a different conclusion to that which they would reach if they did not take it into account.

22 Whether or not a consideration is a relevant material consideration is a question of law for the courts. Decision-makers are under a duty to have regard to all applicable policy as a material consideration.

23 The weight given to a relevant material consideration is a matter of planning judgement. Matters of planning judgement are within the exclusive province of the LPA. This report sets out the weight Officers have given relevant material considerations in making their recommendation to Members. Members, as the decision-makers, are free to use their planning judgement to attribute their own weight, subject to aforementioned directions and the test of reasonableness.

### **5.3 NATIONAL POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance 2014 onwards (NPPG)
- National Design Guidance 2019 (NDG)

### **5.4 DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

24 The Development Plan comprises:

- London Plan (March 2021) (LPP)
- Core Strategy (June 2011) (CSP)
- Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) (DMP)
- Site Allocations Local Plan (June 2013) (SALP)
- Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan (February 2014) (LTCP)

### **5.5 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE**

25 Lewisham SPG/SPD:

#### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2019)

## 5.6 OTHER MATERIAL DOCUMENTS

- Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008)

## 6 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

26 The main issues are:

- Principle of Development
- Urban Design and impact on heritage assets
- Living Conditions of the Neighbours.

### 6.1 PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

#### *General policy*

27 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 11, states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that proposals should be approved without delay so long as they accord with the development plan.

28 The London Plan (LP) sets out a sequential spatial approach to making the best use of land set out in LPP GG2 (Parts A to C) that should be followed.

#### 6.1.1 Principle of development conclusions

29 The Development Plan is generally supportive of people extending or altering their homes. The principle of development is supported, subject to details.

### 6.2 URBAN DESIGN

#### *General Policy*

30 The NPPF at para 126 states the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

31 CSP 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.

32 DMLP 30, Urban design and local character states that all new developments should provide a high standard of design and should respect the existing forms of development in the vicinity. The London Plan, Core Strategy and DMLP policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality urban design.

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- 33 DMP 31 states that extensions will not be permitted where they would adversely affect the architectural integrity of a group of buildings as a whole or cause an incongruous element in terms of the important features of a character area.
- 34 DMP 36 echoes national and regional policy and summarises the steps the borough will take to manage changes to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens so that their value and significance as designated heritage assets is maintained and enhanced.
- 35 Paragraph 4.2.3 of Alterations and Extensions SPD (2019) sets out:
- As a general rule, extensions extending up to 3m in length should be no more than 3m in height on the boundary. Extensions which exceed this length and exceed a height of 2.5m on the boundary are unlikely to be supported.*
- 36 Paragraph 4.2.4 sets out the following guidance for single storey rear extensions in conservation areas:
- Alterations within conservation areas should be of the highest quality design using high quality materials. The rear building line, the size of the rear garden and the prevailing characteristics of adjoining properties should all be taken into account.*
- Rear extensions should:*
- *Remain clearly secondary to the host building in terms of location, form, scale and detailing.*
  - *Respect the original design and architectural features of the existing building.*
  - *On semi-detached properties extensions should not extend beyond the main side walls of the host building.*
  - *Have a ridge height visibly lower than the sill of the first floor windows (2 to 3 brick courses) and roof pitches to complement those of the main building.*
- 37 Paragraph 4.2.5 sets out that:
- A modern, high quality design can be successful in achieving a clear distinction between old and new. In some locations, a traditional approach can be a more sensitive response to a historic building, particularly where homogeneity of groups of buildings is part of their special character.*
- Discussion*
- 38 The existing non-original uPVC rear extension would be removed as part of the proposal. Since the objection by the Telegraph Hill Society was received, the scheme has been amended and the height of the proposed extension has been reduced. The proposed single storey infill extension would have a pitched roof and be 6.525m in depth, 1.81m in width, with a maximum height of 3.43m and a height on the boundary of 2.5m when measured from the ground level of No.38. The proportions of the proposed rear infill extension are within the guidelines of paragraph 4.2.3 of the Alterations and Extensions SPD and considered subordinate to the host property. The side elevation facing the neighbour would consist of London stock brick and thus match the existing side elevation.

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



- 39 Officers note that the Telegraph Hill Society have objected to the proposal on the grounds that the design of the proposed extension does not respect the host building. The proposed extension would be constructed of London stock brick to match the host building. Sliding doors would be installed at the rear elevation. The pitched roof of the proposed extension would have four skylights. The removal of the existing non-original uPVC extension is considered to enhance the appearance of the host building. The proposed extension would utilise a mix of historically appropriate bricks and high quality design features and thus is considered acceptable. As such, the proposed extension is considered a high quality design which achieves a clear distinction between old and new in line with paragraph 4.2.5 of the Alterations and Extensions SPD.
- 40 The two first floor windows at the front elevation, the two first floor windows at the rear elevation, and the first floor window at the side elevation would be replaced as part of the proposal. The features of the proposed replacement windows would match the existing in terms of style, materials and proportions and would be inserted into the existing window openings. There would be no changes to the opening style. The meeting rail height, at 35mm is suitable for Conservation Areas. The windows would be finished white to match the existing. The horn would be an 'ogee' style in keeping with the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. The proposed Accoya timber windows would be of sufficient quality and as such are considered acceptable.
- 41 Two rooflights would be inserted into the rear roof slope and two rooflights inserted into the outrigger roof slope. The proposed rooflights would be a conservation style and sit flush within the roof slope. Officers note that rear rooflights are fairly common on Gellatly Road. Given the modest size and sensitive placement the rooflights are considered acceptable.
- 42 The non-original roof tiles are to be replaced as part of the proposals. The replacement slate roof tiles are proposed to match those as they were historically. As such, the replacement slate tiles are considered acceptable.

### 6.2.1 Impact on Heritage Assets

#### *Policy*

- 43 Heritage assets may be designated—including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, archaeological remains—or non-designated.
- 44 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 gives LPAs the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.
- 45 Relevant paragraphs of Chapter 16 of the NPPF set out how LPAs should approach determining applications that relate to heritage assets. This includes giving great weight to the asset's conservation, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset. Further, that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 46 CSP 16 ensures the value and significance of the borough's heritage assets are among things enhanced and conserved in line with national and regional policy.

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

47 DMP 36 echoes national and regional policy and summarises the steps the borough will take to manage changes to Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens so that their value and significance as designated heritage assets is maintained and enhanced. DMP 37 relates to non-designated heritage assets.

48 Further guidance is given in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008).

#### *Discussion*

49 The application site is located within character area 1a of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. Gellatly Road, Bousfield Road and the west end of Arbuthnot Road form an architecturally cohesive sector of two storey terraces of almost identical design. Properties in this location are built to a smaller scale with a narrower carriageway and smaller front gardens. Their scale, in comparison to the four main roads of the character area, reflects the lower social class of the original residents.

50 The Telegraph Hill Society have objected to the loss of the side bay window and original fabric of the host building required as part of the infill extension. The bay is a traditional feature on Victorian terraced housing and is an integral part of the character of this type of housing. It is set to the rear on a less visible side elevation where views are to only the upper floor of the house adjacent. The removal would result in the loss of a historic feature of a degree of architectural interest. The impact on the character and appearance of the CA would be negligible given the minimal visibility. The impact on the Non Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA - i.e. the host property which makes a positive contribution to the CA) would be to erode its architectural integrity somewhat and that of the terrace within which it falls. NPPF para 203 requires that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. In this case the significance of the HA is moderate (being a NDHA that makes a positive contribution to a CA, within a consistent group of NDHAS) and the scale of harm or loss is at the low end of less than substantial, affecting the NDHA in a minimally visible location.

51 The Telegraph Hill Society have objected to the loss of the side bay window and original fabric of the host building required as part of the infill extension. The bay is a traditional feature on some Victorian terraced housing in the Conservation Area and is an integral part of the character of this type of housing. However, it is set to the rear on a less visible side elevation and hidden behind the existing unsympathetic rear extension. As such views are restricted to the adjoining house. If the existing extension were removed, views from the public realm (Lindo Street and Selden Road) would be extremely limited, if at all given the depth of the gardens and the garages present at the end of the gardens of Nos 36, 38 and 40. Therefore, while the removal would result in the loss of a historic feature of a degree of architectural interest, the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be negligible given the minimal visibility. As such, no harm to the Conservation Area is identified. In reaching this conclusion, Officers have also considered the impact of the proposed rooflights.

52 NPPF para 203 requires that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

the significance of the heritage asset. The effect of this proposal would be to erode the NDHAs architectural integrity somewhat and that of the terrace within which it falls. In this case the significance of the NDHA is low (being a NDHA that makes a positive contribution to a CA but which has previously been unsympathetically altered, within a moderately consistent group of NDHAS) and the scale of harm or loss is at the low end of less than substantial, affecting the NDHA in a minimally visible location. As such, the impact of the proposal on the NDHA is also considered acceptable.

- 53 The Telegraph Hill Society quotes application DC/14/89277 regarding the loss of a side bay window which was refused and dismissed on appeal. This is not a materially similar precedent as the bay window in question was visible from the public realm, which both the delegated officer and planning inspector gave considerable weight. As the bay window at No.36 is not visible from the public realm, the two applications are not comparable. Several properties within this terrace have previously been granted planning permission for side infill extensions of a similar nature, notably at Nos 48 (DC/18/108523) and (DC/12/080832/FT).
- 54 Officers, having regard to the statutory duties in respect of listed buildings in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the relevant paragraphs in the NPPF in relation to conserving the historic environment, are satisfied the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area.

### **6.2.2 Urban design conclusion**

- 55 In summary, the extension, due to its design and use of high-quality materials, would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The other alterations to replace the windows and to insert new rooflights are also acceptable and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 56 Officers conclude that the proposal responds sensitively to its context and the character of the surrounding area and therefore is acceptable in terms of design.

## **6.3 LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEIGHBOURS**

### *General Policy*

- 57 NPPF para 130 sets an expectation that new development will be designed to create places that amongst other things have a 'high standard' of amenity for existing and future users. At para 185 it states decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health and living conditions
- 58 This is reflected in relevant policies of the London Plan (D3), the Core Strategy (CP15), the Local Plan (DMP 31) and associated guidance (Alterations and Extensions SPD 2019).
- 59 The Council has published the Alterations and Extensions SPD (2019) which establishes generally acceptable standards relating to these matters (see below), although site context will mean these standards could be tightened or relaxed accordingly.
- 60 Daylight and sunlight are generally measured against the Building Research Establishment (BRE) standards however this is not formal planning guidance and should be applied flexibly according to context

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

## *Discussion*

- 61 The proposed infill extension would be located on the southern side of the property and not exceed the line of the existing outrigger. As such, it will not impact the amenity of No.34, located to the north.
- 62 Officers note that comments raised by the Telegraph Hill Society in objection to the proposal have concerns over loss of light and enclosure for No.38, particularly the impact upon the windows in the northern facing side elevation. Since the Telegraph Hill Society's objection, the height of the proposed has been reduced so that it would measure 2.5m on the boundary when measured from the ground level of No.38. Officers note that no objection has been received from the neighbour at No 38 in the planning process.
- 63 The proposed extension would be located 1.66m from the windows in the side elevation of No.38. The boundary height of the proposed infill extension, at 2.5m, is within the Guidelines of the Alterations and Extensions SPD and considered modest enough to not impact the amenity of No.38 via loss of daylight or sunlight. There is an existing rear extension at No. 38 with a glazed roof which provides the primary source of natural light to the rear ground floor of the property. Whilst it is expected that proposed extension may impact upon the level of daylight or sunlight of the ground floor side elevation windows at No.38, on balance this is considered acceptable given that the window is located at lower ground level facing the side return and naturally would expect to receive lower level of light, and the glazing at the rear extension would remain unaffected.
- 64 The Telegraph Hill Society has objected to the proposed extension on the grounds that it would create a 'wind tunnel' at the rear of No.38. The scale of the development is such that this is not a realistic proposition and Officers are satisfied no such impact would arise.
- 65 The Telegraph Hill Society objected to the proposed extension on the grounds that the skylights in the side extension would shine into the windows of the neighbouring property and impact their amenity. The lighting in the proposed extension and kitchen would come from the ceiling. As such, no light will shine directly at the neighbour's property.
- 66 The proposed rooflights would face skywards and not offer a view of a neighbouring property. The proposed extension would not offer any new lines of sight not already available from the host building or garden. As such, it will not impact the privacy of the neighbours.
- 67 The application site will remain a single family dwellinghouse. No increase in noise or disturbance is expected.

### **6.3.1 Impact on neighbours conclusion**

- 68 The proposed development would not introduce any unacceptably harmful impacts to the living conditions of any of the neighbouring properties and therefore would be compliant with LPP D3, CSP 15 and DMP 31 and the provisions of the 2019 SPD.

## **7 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

- 69 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:

### **Is this report easy to understand?**

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- 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
- sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

70 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.

71 The CIL is therefore a material consideration.

72 This application does not attract CIL.

## 8 EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

73 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.

74 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

75 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.

76 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>

77 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
- Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making

### Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- Engagement and the equality duty
- Equality objectives and the equality duty
- Equality information and the equality duty

78 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>

79 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.

## 9 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATION

80 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:

- Article 8: Respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence
- Protocol 1, Article 1: Right to peaceful enjoyment of your property

81 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.

82 Members need to satisfy themselves that the potential adverse amenity impacts are acceptable and that any potential interference with the above Convention 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.

83 This application has the legitimate aim of providing an extension to an existing residential property. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including Article 8 and Protocol 1 are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

## 10 CONCLUSION

84 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.

### Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>



85 In reaching this recommendation, Officers have given weight to the comments and objections that were received regarding this application and consider the proposed development would preserve the host building and Telegraph Hill Conservation Area in terms of design. No unacceptable harm would arise to the living conditions of neighbours, therefore Officers recommend that planning permission should be granted subject to the imposition of suitable planning conditions.

## 11 RECOMMENDATION

86 That the Committee resolve to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions and informatives:

### 11.1 CONDITIONS

1) FULL PLANNING PERMISSION TIME LIMIT

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) DEVELOP IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED PLANS

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

EA.2048\_000; EA.2048\_001; EA.2048\_002; EA.2048\_003; EA.2048\_004;  
EA.2048\_100; EA.2048\_101; EA.2048\_103. **Received 11 August 2021.**

REA.2048\_501; REA.2048\_502; REA.2048\_503; REA.2048\_504;  
REA.2048\_502; REA.2048\_505. **Received 17 August 2021.**

EA.2048\_102. **Received 19 October 2021.**

**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) MATERIALS

(a) The development shall be constructed in those materials as submitted namely: London stock brick (in a Flemish bond), slate roof tiles, timber windows finished white, conservation style rooflights, powder coated aluminium doors and in full accordance with the relevant plans.

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

**Reason:** To ensure that the design is delivered in accordance with the details submitted and assessed so that the development achieves the necessary high standard and detailing in accordance with Policies 15 High quality design for

### Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

## 11.2 INFORMATIVES

- 1) Positive and Proactive Statement: The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.

## 12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1) Submission drawings
- 2) Submission technical reports and documents
- 3) Statutory consultee responses

## 13 REPORT AUTHOR AND CONTACT

Report author: Max Curson (Planning Officer)

Email: [max.curson@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:max.curson@lewisham.gov.uk)

Telephone: 020 8314 7219

### Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>