



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/21/3287705

37 Manor Lane, London SE13 5QW

- 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 /Ms Jonathan and Jill Gill/Loughran against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/122824, dated 26 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing partial width dormer window with new full width dormer and insertion of new flush rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this appeal 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 house dating from around the start of the 20th century. It sits at the end of a terrace of 6 similar London Stock brick houses that backs on to the public park at Manor House Gardens and is located on Manor Lane, a street at the heart of the CA made up of similar terraces. The appeal property exemplifies the terraced houses on narrow plots with small front gardens, which 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.
4. The appeal property has been the subject of earlier extensions, including the existing partial rear roof dormer that the proposal would replace with a larger rear roof dormer that would be the full width of the house. This would also include the replacement of the existing end of terrace hipped roof form, with a new gable end and 2 roof lights in the front roof slope. The existing pair of

chimneys that engage with the flank wall would be retained, along with some decorative corbelling.

5. The hipped roof form of the end of terrace appeal property is characteristic of the terraces in the local area and the CA. The visual effect of the original design of hipped roof with tall chimneys design provides a grand termination to the end of the terraces. Where houses in the area, brought to my attention by the appellant, have been altered to gable ends, it is evident that this effect is diminished, weakening the coherence of the symmetrical design of the terraces as a whole. The proposal would result in the same effect and would appear visually discordant within its terrace and when viewed in conjunction with the neighbouring end of terrace property and its retained hipped roof form.
6. The 2 rooflights proposed would be large and very apparent within the extended roof as proposed. From my site visit it was clear that where there are rooflights in the front roof slopes of other similar residential properties in the local area, they are generally single and, even if in pairs, significantly smaller than that proposed. The proposal would therefore not only impact of on the roof of the appeal property but would also interrupt the visual coherence the terrace of which it forms part and the roofscape of the wider area, introducing incongruous elements that would detract from the general coherence of the local street scene.
7. The proposal would also include a full width zinc clad dormer extension on the rear roof slope. Due to its width and projection, facilitated by the proposed hip to gable extension, this would appear as a large and unduly prominent roof extension that would be a visually dominating presence on the roof of the existing house and the terrace of which it forms part. This effect would be very apparent in views from within Manor House Gardens, where the roofscape of the surrounding houses form the backdrop to the setting of this Grade II listed park.
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. The larger dormer extensions that the appellant has brought to my attention are within the existing roofs of mid terrace properties. As this is not the case with the proposal, which involves a hip to gable extension of an end of terrace appeal property, these are not directly similar in that regard and I have, therefore, given these little weight in my considerations.
9. For these reasons I find that the proposed development, would be harmful to the character and appearance off the appeal property, that of the local area and the significant of the CA. This would be contrary to Sections 5.7 and 5.8 of the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019), 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 Sections 12 and 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, promotes local distinctiveness and is site specific, having due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets.

10. 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 with improved 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

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

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR