



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3248100

67 Micheldever Road, London SE12 8LU

- 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 Nick Glynn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
- The application Ref DC/19/114808, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2020.
- The proposed development is described on the application forms as "loft extension to comprise zinc 60 degree mansard and pair of structural glass dormer windows. Additionally restoration of previously reduced rear sash window to existing proportions."

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. During my site visit, I observed that the proposed restoration of one of the rear windows at first-floor level has already been implemented. I understand that this alteration was implemented in accordance with the terms of planning permission Ref DC/20/115412, which was approved by the Council on 23 March 2020 during the course of the appeal. As such my recommendation focuses on the alterations to the roof.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lee Manor Conservation Area (LMCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that with respect to development affecting buildings or other land in a conservation area, "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."
 6. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey dwelling on the southern side of Micheldever Road and is situated within the LMCA. The Lee Manor Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) sets out that the special interest of the LMCA
-

is largely derived from the architectural quality of its buildings, the consistent scale, form, style and motifs seen within distinctive building groups, and its tree-lined streets. Indeed, the appeal property is set within a short terrace of five dwellings that is characterised by its balanced and coherent appearance. While No 65 has been extended at roof-level with two rear dormer windows, these appear as discreet additions which do not appear overtly dominant within its roofslope and preserve the overall uniformity of the terrace as seen within private views from the rear.

7. The proposed mansard roof would occupy the whole of the rear roofslope and would be constructed of zinc with two glass dormer windows. Due to its size, form and materiality, the proposed mansard roof extension would appear as a particularly idiosyncratic element within the roofscape of the terrace. Unlike other parts of the LMCA where there are visible examples of modern roof extensions and an emerging contemporary aesthetic in the built environment, any rear roof extensions seen from the rear garden of the appeal site are more traditional in their scale, form and design. Although not visible in the street scene, given the prevailing traditional architectural idiom the proposed mansard extension would appear overtly incongruous within private views from the rear gardens of properties fronting Micheldever Road and Southbrook Road. I agree that the proposed materials would be of a high standard, nevertheless they would fail to successfully integrate with the markedly traditional appearance of the surrounding built environment.
8. Due to its scale, bulk and departure from the established roofscape of the terrace, the proposed mansard extension would appear as an overly-dominant addition that would disturb the original proportions of the appeal property and unbalance the visual cohesion of the terrace. As the resultant appearance of the appeal property would deviate starkly from the consistent scale, form, style and motifs of adjoining properties within the terrace, it would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and special interest of the LMCA.
9. I acknowledge that the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (the SPD) constitutes guidance which should not be prescriptively interpreted without due regard to the surrounding context of any particular site, and I note that it advises that a modern, high quality design of a roof extension is generally more successful as it would contrast with and maintain the integrity of the original dwelling. Indeed the pictorial example shown in the SPD appears to be the extension at No 62 Manor Lane referred to elsewhere in the appellant's evidence. However, the SPD also advises that where the roofscape of a street is consistent and not interrupted by alterations then a new mansard extension would be resisted, but that where a sympathetic, traditional style mansard has been established as an accepted and prevailing characteristic within the street, then future traditional style mansard proposals will be considered. Despite the twin dormers at No 65 and on a few other properties in the street, the roofscape is generally consistent. Furthermore, mansard roofs do not form a prevailing characteristic of the street. Overall, the proposal would conflict with the SPD.
10. The appellant has drawn me to examples of modern roof extensions elsewhere within the LMCA. With regard to No 64 Manor Lane, the Inspector had regard to the immediate context of the site, where they saw that there were several modern roof extensions in close proximity and remarked that the proposed roof

extension would not appear out-of-place. This was also the case for the appeal at No 26 Manor Lane, where the Inspector observed that there were properties along Manor Lane which featured extensions of similar size. However, the appeal site and its immediate surroundings are decidedly traditional in character, with no modern roof-level development within view. These two precedents therefore do not provide any justification for the proposal.

11. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other examples at Nos, 14, 15, 22 and 62 Manor Lane, 30 Lampmead Road and 52 Aisilbe Road. As these examples are situated some distance from the appeal site, the context of each of these sites is different from that of the appeal site and so are not comparable.
12. As such, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the LMCA contrary to the requirements of the Act. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 (the London Plan), Policy 16 of the Core Strategy and DM Policy 36 of the Development Management Plan (DMP) which, amongst other things, require that development proposals should conserve the significance of heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy 15 of the Core Strategy and DM Policy 30 of the DMP, which state, amongst things, that development proposals should be designed to the highest standards and should respond positively to local character. The proposal would also fail to accord with DM Policy 31 of the DMP, which states that extensions will not be permitted where they would adversely affect the architectural integrity of a group of buildings or appear as an incongruous element.
13. In addition, the proposal would conflict with the SPD as set out above, and part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset.
14. The harm that the proposed development would cause to the significance of the LMCA would be less than substantial. However, there would be no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR