

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3165019
70 Boyne Road, London, SE13 5AW.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Euan & Nicki Morrison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/098259 dated 9 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is for the conversion of the existing roof space into a bedroom and bathroom and the addition of a rear/side facing dormer to the existing roofline.
-

Preliminary matter

1. Whilst not referred to in the description for the proposal on the submitted application form, the drawings and the description for the proposal, as set out in the submitted design and access statement, indicate that the scheme includes the reinstatement of the original front door arrangement. The submitted drawings also indicate three new windows on the side elevation of the dwelling along with an increase in size of the side and rear doors.
2. To reflect this and in the interests of precision I propose to slightly amend the description for the proposed development to: *the conversion of the existing roof space into a bedroom and bathroom, the addition of a rear/side facing dormer to the existing roofline, two roof-lights in the front roof-slope of the dwelling, various alterations and new fenestration in the side and rear elevations and the reinstatement of the original front door arrangement.*

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of the existing roof space into a bedroom and bathroom, the addition of a rear/side facing dormer to the existing roofline, two roof-lights in the front roof-slope of the dwelling, various alterations and new fenestration in the side elevation and the reinstatement of the original front door arrangement at 70 Boyne Road, London, SE13 5AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/098259 dated 9 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
-

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 70 BR PL 00, 70 BR S 00, 70 BR PA 01, 70 BR P 01, 70 BR P 02, 70 BR P 03, 70 BR P 04, 70 BR P 05, 70 BR P 06, 70 BR P 11, 70 BR P 12, 70 BR P 13, 70 BR P 14, 70 BR P 15 Rev A, 70 Br P 16 and 70 BR P 17.
- 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the new/altered windows and doors hereby permitted shall match those of the host dwelling.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of the roof extension hereby permitted details of the proposed colour and finish of the proposed zinc and timber cladding shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) The window in the side elevation of the proposed dormer extension and the proposed new first floor window in the side elevation of the dwelling shall be permanently obscure glazed and shall be non-opening below a height of 1.7 metres above the floor of the rooms in which the windows are installed and such glazing shall be retained thereafter.
- 6) The proposed roof-lights on the front roof-slope must be set flush with the roof and be of a conservation style with a central glazing bar.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and the Belmont Conservation Area (BCA).

Reasons

5. To the north of Belmont Hill the BCA is primarily characterised by two storey semi-detached and terraced Edwardian houses constructed in the early 20th century. The dwellings, which are from a limited range of designs, have uniform front building lines and are set back from the highway behind small front gardens. Typically the gardens are enclosed by walls and some of the dwellings occupy elevated positions and feature steps and raised gardens. The soft planting within the front gardens softens the appearance of the street scene and the sloping topography within the area provides elevated views within and beyond the conservation area.
6. The Appeal property is located within a row of uniformly designed semi-detached dwellings which step up gradually to the south and occupy an elevated position within the street scene. The dwelling is one of a pair of symmetrically designed semi-detached dwellings with fully hipped dark coloured plain tiled roofs, two storey front projecting bays and wide, attached two storey rear projecting wings. At the front the dwellings are largely unaltered, although the main entrance door to the Appeal dwelling has an unsympathetic stuccoed portico addition.

7. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act) requires that when assessing proposals for new development within a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance.
8. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to its conservation. Any harm requires clear and convincing justification, whilst opportunities for new development in conservation areas should be sought. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. Policy 16 of the Lewesham Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Core Strategy) and policy DM36 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Policies Local Plan (Local Plan) are consistent with both Section 72 of the LBCA Act and Section 12 of the NPPF. Together they require extensions to be compatible with the special characteristics of conservation areas, its buildings, spaces, settings, scale, form and materials.
10. Together and amongst other things the NPPF, policies 7.4 & 7.6 of The London Plan 2016, policies DM30 & DM31 of the Local Plan and policy 15 of the Core Strategy seek the highest quality design and the protection or enhancement of the historic environment. Extensions should respect the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of existing buildings and use high quality matching or complementary materials.
11. The proposed roof extension would be located on the side roof-slope of the rear projecting wing, where it would be recessed behind the side roof-slope of the front section of the dwelling. At the same time the dwelling at 72 Boyne Road (No.72), is taller than the Appeal dwelling and the gap between No.72 and the front section of the Appeal dwelling is narrow. As a consequence the proposed roof extension would be screened in views from Boyne Road.
12. The proposed roof extension would be clad in zinc and timber, which would compliment and blend in appropriately with the existing roof tiles, provided they are of an appropriate colour and finish.
13. To the rear the proposed roof extension would sit between the existing rear projecting wings of the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.72. It would also be partially screened by the existing chimney and would be sited at least four metres behind the rear building line of the property. As a result the proposed roof extension would be visually discrete within the rear garden environment and would not be visible from Caterham Road.
14. Whilst deeper than the existing roof extension at 6 Caterham Road, the rear projecting wing at the Appeal property is deeper and the proposed roof extension would be contained between two rear projecting wings. As a consequence, the proposed roof extension would be visually more discrete.
15. It is noted that the proposed dormer extension would conflict with the Councils Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), in-so-far as the dormer would project to the side of the rear projecting wing's roof-slope. However, it would accord with the objectives of the SPD, which require roof

extensions to be subordinate to the principal elevation, to successfully integrate with and preserve the character of the building. At the same time proposed roof extensions should protect front elevations from significant change, be set at least one metre behind the eaves line and should be constructed from materials that are compatible with the existing roof materials.

16. For these reasons the proposed roof extension would respect the character and appearance of the host building and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
17. The proposed reinstatement of the original front door arrangement represents a significant enhancement to the building and the contribution it makes to the street scene and the BCA as a whole. The proposed new and altered fenestration would be discretely located at the side and rear of the property, where it would be screened from public viewpoints. As a consequence it would have a negligible effect on the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the character, appearance and significance of the conservation area.
18. Finally, the Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to glazing restrictions, the nature of the proposed roof-lights and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions are necessary to ensure the proposal blends in appropriately with the host dwelling, to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of No.72 and in the interests of certainty.
19. The Council has also suggested the imposition of a condition requiring matching materials. In relation to the proposed fenestration this is necessary to ensure the proposal respects the host property and the conservation area. However, the materials for the cladding of the proposed roof extension are different to the existing roof materials. As such a condition is necessary to ensure that the colour and finish of the proposed zinc and timber cladding blends in appropriately with the existing roof of the property.
20. I conclude that the proposed roof extension would respect and blend in appropriately with the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. It would preserve the character, appearance and significance of the BCA as a whole. The scheme would therefore comply with policies 15 & 16 of the Core Strategy, policies DM30, DM31 & DM36 of the Local Plan, policies 7.4 & 7.6 of the London Plan, the objectives of the SPD and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR