The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2022

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/21/3281143
120 Manor Lane, London SE12 8LR

- 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 Tim Francis against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
- The application Ref DC/21/122081, dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2021.
- The development proposed is a hipped dormer extension to rear roof slope.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, local area and the Lee Manor Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached, Edwardian, London stock brick house with a hipped roof form. Located on Manor Lane, a street at the heart of the CA, the appeal property backs on to the public park at Manor House Gardens.

4. The appeal property exemplifies the Edwardian houses that define much of the character and appearance of the local area and the CA, contributing to its significance. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

5. The main part of the proposal is for a zinc clad dormer extension on the rear roof slope. This would follow the hipped profile of the roof, being approximately its full width, with only minimal setbacks from the rear elevation and the ridges of the hipped roof.

6. This would result in a dormer extension that would be contrary to the guidance for such extensions set out in sections 5.7 of the Lewisham Alterations and

Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019). Due to its width and projection the proposed rear dormer extension would appear as a large and unduly prominent roof extension, which would be a visually dominating presence in the rear roof of the semi-detached pair of which the appeal property forms part. This would result in an unbalanced appearance between the semi-detached pair, whose appearance currently exhibits considerable symmetry and a balanced appearance that demonstrates significant architectural quality.

7. This unbalanced effect would be very apparent in views of the appeal property and the CA from within Manor House Gardens, listed as Grade II on the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, where the roofscape of the surrounding houses, including the appeal property, form the backdrop to its setting.

8. Although it is apparent from my site visit that rear dormer extensions are common within the local area and the wider CA, many of these appear to be of some age and the larger dormer extensions are generally within the rear roofs of mid terrace properties.

9. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other more recent dormer extensions that have been carried out in the local area, however, I find that, although there are some aesthetic similarities, these are not directly similar to the proposal in overall form and positioning on their host roofs and would have been considered on their own merits, I have, therefore, given these only moderate weight in my considerations.

10. The 2 heritage style rooflights proposed within the front roof slope would not be so large that they would appear as unduly prominent features that would interrupt the visual coherence of the appeal property and the shared roofscape of the semi-detached pair and would not cause harm to its character and appearance, that of the local area and the significance of the CA.

11. For the reasons given above I find that the proposed development, when considered as a whole, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part, that of the local area and the significance of the CA. This would be contrary to Sections 5.7 the SPD, Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2021), Policies DM30, DM31 and DM36 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development is of high-quality design, a key aspect of sustainable development, having due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets.

12. Although I find the harm to the CA would be considered less than substantial, in accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of those assets. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger property, improving amenity for its occupiers, these are primarily private benefits. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA and, in addition, significant weight to the effects on the

character and appearance of the appeal property and the local area that I have identified. I consider that these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR