



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2019

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/19/3239474
116 Dennetts Road, London SE14 5LW

- 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 Daniel Woodham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/112585, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension, it will have timber windows and be finished in natural grey slate. The proposed extension into the roof would house an additional bedroom and bathroom facility, be constructed from identical materials to the main house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above is based on that of the planning application form omitting elements that do not constitute an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area (the CA) and whether any harm to the significance of the CA is outbalanced by any public benefits.

Reasons

4. The CA is characterised by its regular street pattern, clearly laid out in a planned manner, and by strong building lines which provide a pleasant and harmonious feel to the area. The area's character is established in large part from the predominance of two and three storey houses built to standardised designs between 1870-1900. The significance of the CA lies in the good, well preserved examples of late 19th century middle class houses and villas which remain largely unaltered externally.
5. The appeal site is located in the west edge of the CA, in a quiet residential street, part of a short row of mid 19th century two storey terraced houses with butterfly roofs concealed behind parapets with stucco cornices. These remain largely unaltered externally, and make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the CA. As a result of bomb damage and

demolition, the immediately surrounding area includes a more diverse, contemporary range of building styles, mixed with mid 19th century development.

6. Although Dennetts Road does present a wider variety of styles than other streets within the CA, the value and character of the short row of mid 19th century terraced houses, of which the appeal site is part of, is significant. In my view, the short row of terraced houses forms a strong feature when the buildings are viewed from ground level, particularly the roof line, greatly contributing to the character of the street and uniting it in design and form to the wider CA. The fact the roof line of the short row of terraced houses has been preserved, further highlights its relative importance.
7. The development proposed is a mansard roof extension which is to be designed in such a way as to preserve the original butterfly roof of the host building and use materials sympathetic to the area. The appellant also proposes the mansard to be set back from the parapet as to minimise its impact on the terrace.
8. On the front elevation, although the mansard roof extension would be set back behind the parapet, due to its height, form and design, it would still be prominent and clearly visible above the parapet when viewed from ground level. This would dilute the architectural significance of the short row of terraced houses. The appearance of the rear elevation, despite the retention of the butterfly roof form through the construction of a new parapet, would still be altered. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
9. The development would not, therefore, preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy 15 and Policy 16 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011), DM Policy 30, DM Policy 31, DM Policy 36 and DM Policy 37 of the Development Management Local Plan (2014), and the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019).
10. When considered alongside the diverse character of the area and the modest scale of the development, I characterise the magnitude of this harm as less than substantial. The Framework requires that, where a development proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. No particular public benefits have been brought to my attention in relation to the proposed development, albeit I recognise that there would be private benefits for the occupants of the dwelling. I also acknowledge that there would be some public benefit in terms of improving housing stock and that the investment would be of some benefit to the local economy. However, any such public benefits would be very modest given the small scale of the development. These would be substantially outweighed by the relatively significant harm arising, bearing in mind the importance and protection given to designated heritage assets by statute and national and local planning policy.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR