



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 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: 11 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3255109

13 Bousfield Road, London SE14 5TP

- 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 Beedie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/115686, dated 12 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2020.
 - The proposed development was originally described as "rear dormers with mansard infill".
-

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. The name of the applicant on the application form is Mr Beedie. The name of the appellant on the appeal form is Mr Greg Beedie. It has been confirmed in subsequent correspondence from the agent that this is the same person.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area (THCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace property on the eastern side of Bousfield Road. During my site visit, I observed from the rear garden of the appeal site that the rear elevations of the terraced properties were characterised by their pitched roof forms and two-storey outriggers, with no rear dormer or other form of roof extension to any property within the terrace visible. The site lies within the THCA, whose significance is largely derived from the uniform and cohesive architectural character of the area's Victorian dwellinghouses.
 6. The proposed dormers and the associated central infill would extend across much of the width of the rear roofslope. While the proposed dormers would align with the rear-facing windows of lower floors, their height would be almost level with the roof ridge and so they would appear especially large within the
-

roofslope. Due to its excessive scale, height and form, the proposal would appear as an unsympathetic addition that would overwhelm and distort the original proportions of the rear roofslope and fail to have an appropriately subservient appearance, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the appeal property. Although the proposal would not be visible from the public realm, within private views from neighbouring properties the proposal would appear particularly out-of-keeping with the rest of the terrace due to its bulky and incongruous form. The proposal would therefore undermine the uniform and cohesive architectural character of the wider terrace, and so would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, as well as the significance of the THCA.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to many other examples of development, many of which are within other Conservation Areas such as the example at 194B Tressillian Road. However, the significance of these Conservation Areas may be different to that of the THCA, and so I cannot determine whether or not these examples provide any justification when the full details and circumstances of these proposals are not before me to consider. Similarly, I do not have the details of many cited examples of development within the THCA, and so these examples also provide no justification for the proposal before me.
8. The appellant has provided drawings and a decision notice relating to a particular scheme at 146 Waller Road. However, from the rear elevation drawings, it appears that No 146 and the adjoining properties have different ground levels. Furthermore, No 144 has a three-storey outrigger whereas Nos 146 and 148 have no outrigger. Based solely on the evidence before me, it appears that these properties do not have the same sense of visual cohesion and uniformity as the appeal property and the terrace in which it is set, and so this example is not directly comparable to the proposal before me.
9. Also, the appellant refers to 17 Arbuthnot Road nearby. However, I observed that this property had two small dormers with no infill section and so is not comparable to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding all these examples, each appeal must be considered on its own merits.
10. The appellant refers to Section 5 of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Appraisal, which does not specifically state that rear roof extensions are detrimental to the area's character and appearance. The appellant also refers to the reasoning of a Planning Committee in relation to an application at No 88 Drakefell Road which appears to resist a general concern that rear extensions are eroding the character of the area. However, the absence of any explicit mention in the Appraisal, and the Committee's comments, does not mean that such extensions could not be harmful.
11. The appellant refers to Policy 16 of the Core Strategy 2011 (the Core Strategy), which states that "*the borough's heritage assets... will be valued positively and considered as central to the regeneration of the borough*". However, the supporting text to this policy states that the regeneration of the borough will be based on the development of a number of large sites. As such, the reference to "*regeneration*" within Policy 16 refers to broader, strategic objectives and so does not provide justification for small-scale householder extensions such as the proposal before me.

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of roof extensions shown within the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (the SPD). However, I am not aware of the context of these particular extensions and so cannot attest the degree to which they are comparable.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the THCA, and so would cause harm to its special interest as a designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (the London Plan), Policy 15 of the Core Strategy, and Policy DM30 of the Development Management Local Plan 2014 (the DMLP) which, amongst other things, state that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, be of the highest architectural quality and relate positively to the existing townscape. The proposal would also conflict with Policy DM31 of the DMLP, which states that roof extensions should respect and complement the form and detailing of the original building.
14. The proposal would also conflict with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, Policy 16 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM36 of the DMLP which, amongst other things, state that development should conserve the significance of heritage assets.
15. The proposal would also conflict with Sections 5.7 and 5.8 of the SPD, which state that rear dormers should be well spaced and positioned within the existing roof slope and that rear roof extensions in conservation areas will only be considered where the applicant can demonstrate exceptional design quality.
16. The harm that the proposed development would cause to the significance of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area would be less than substantial. However, even if I were to consider the replacement of the existing concrete roof tiles with slate as a public benefit, this would be a very minor benefit and would not outweigh the harm.

Other Matters

17. The appellant states the proposal would optimise the use of the site and would provide an improved living environment for them and their family, and I note the support given in the National Planning Policy Framework for upward extensions. Nonetheless, I have found that it would not do so in a manner that would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the THCA.
18. While I note that no objection was submitted by neighbouring occupants, I have nevertheless found that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm.
19. The appellant suggests that the proposal would likely comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) (England) 2015 (as amended), were it not in a conservation area. However, the site is in the THCA and causes harm to it.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. 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

21. 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