



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: 3RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/21/3286246

109 Brightfield Road, London SE12 8QG

- 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 N Haukohl against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/122472, dated 30 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey wrap around extension to the rear and roof extension to the main rear roof slope, together with lowering of the basement floor level, construction of replacement front boundary wall with metal railings, installation of two front roof lights and one roof light to the rear outrigger, increase in roof ridge height, installation of replacement larger window to the rear elevation and removal of a chimney stack.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey wrap around extension to the rear and roof extension to the main rear roof slope, together with lowering of the basement floor level, construction of replacement front boundary wall with metal railings, installation of two front roof lights and one roof light to the rear outrigger, increase in roof ridge height, installation of replacement larger window to the rear elevation and removal of a chimney stack at 109 Brightfield Road, London SE12 8QG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/122472, dated 30 June 2021, subject to the following conditions
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2103/EX/000; 2103/EX/001; 2103/EX/002; 2103/EX/003; 2103/EX/004; 2103/EX/005; 2103/EX/006; 2103/EX/008; 2103/EX/009; 2103/EX/010; 2103/P/101; 2103/P/102; 2103/P/103; 2103/P/104 Rev A; 2103/P/105 Rev A; 2103/P/106 Rev A; 2103/P/107 Rev A; 2103/P/108 Rev A; 2103/P/109 Rev A; 2103/P/110 Rev A; 2103/P/111 Rev A.
 - 3) Prior to the installation of the front railings, roof lights, roof of the ground floor wrap around extension and enlarged window details of, their design and materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning

Authority. The design detail and materials so approved shall be used in their construction.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey early 20th century gable ended London stock brick house, with a shallow palisaded front and a narrow rear garden. It sits on that part of Brightfield Road that backs on to the public park at Manor House Gardens, a Grade II listed historic park and is located next to one of its entrances. The main part of the gabled flank wall of the appeal property, which is adjacent to the park entrance, is in London stock brick. Beyond the main flank wall of the house is what appears to be the roughly rendered over remains of a single storey outshoot at the rear, including a disused chimney.
4. 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.
5. The proposal would involve raising the ridge height of the roof of the appeal property, to match that of its adjoining neighbour and the other houses in the terrace. This would involve an increase in the height of the gabled part of the flank wall. This would be an improvement on the existing situation, where the step down in ridge height and concomitant roof angles results in a visually clumsy relationship between the roof of the appeal property and the rest of the terrace.
6. It is further proposed that the disused chimney to the rear part of the flank wall is removed, and the entirety of the flank wall be reclad in London stock brick to match existing, including that part that is currently rendered, and would extend to align with the existing single storey rear extension. Not only would this significantly improve the thermal efficiency of the appeal dwelling, but it would also regularise the appearance of the flank wall as a whole, which does not currently reflect the qualities of the rest of the appeal property, surrounding houses area or the adjacent park.
7. The proposed zinc clad rear dormer extension is of high-quality contemporary design that would set back from the roof edges of the raised roof ridge and, although covering a slightly greater extent of the rear roof slope than recommended in the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD), is, given the size constraints of a relatively narrow property, generally in accordance with this guidance.

8. Due to the opening in the building frontage on Brightfield Road for the park entrance, it would appear that a part of the proposed dormer's side cheek would be visible in longer views of the property from along the street. However, given its proposed setbacks and raised gable, it would appear as recessive and not as a prominent feature in these views.
9. The recessive qualities of the proposed extension would also mean that, when viewed from within the park, in combination with the other rear dormer extensions on properties backing on to the park, the proposed extension would be of a bulk, scale and massing that would result in it so as to appearing as recessive and subordinate to the appeal dwelling and not a dominating feature. The proposed dormer extension would, therefore, result in the retention of the architectural integrity of the appeal property, the terrace of which it forms part and the cohesion of the townscape generally.
10. The proposed roof lights in the front roof slope of the appeal property are positioned and of a size and scale that follows the guidance in the SPD. I find that these would not result in significant interruption of the character and appearance of the appeal property. A few houses at the other end of the terrace, of which the appeal property forms part, do have roof lights and the rooflights as proposed would not be out of keeping with the general roofscape and street scene of the local area.
11. I concur with the Council's view that the proposed wrap around single storey rear extension with internal alteration, replacement of front boundary wall with metal railings, rear roof light to the rear outrigger, and installation of replacement larger window in the rear elevation are not elements that would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property or that of the local area.
12. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, that of the local area or the significance of the CA. The proposal would, therefore, accord with 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 local character and the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to the councils suggested condition relating to all materials and details being approved prior to commencement of the proposed development, including those that would match to the existing or are detailed on the plans. I find, however, that, as the plans contain sufficient detail appropriate to the scale of the development and, given the degree of proposed change, such a pre-commencement condition would not be necessary or proportionate.
14. To ensure the design quality proposed materialises and that the character and appearance of the CA is preserved or enhanced I have, therefore, along with the standard conditions on implementation and adherence to approved plans

attached a more limited condition requiring that details and materials to be used for the proposed railings, roof lights, roof of the ground floor wrap around extension and enlarged window are approved prior to their installation.

Conclusion

15. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR