



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 DECEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/22/3307007

69 Belmont Hill, Lewisham, London SE13 5AX

- 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 Dean Shirley against the decision of London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/126756, dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of a dormer roof extension to the rear and outrigger roof slope and insertion of three rooflights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a dormer roof extension to the rear and outrigger roof slope and insertion of three rooflights to the front roof slope at 69 Belmont Hill, Lewisham, London SE13 5AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/126756, dated 13 May 2022, 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; General Arrangement, Drawing Number PGA011 Revision B; General Arrangement – Drawing Number PGA012 Revision B.
 - 3) No external materials, including fenestration and zinc cladding, shall be used until details of these materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is a more accurate description of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Belmont Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. Although it is located close to Lewisham town centre, it is within a predominantly residential

area where there are properties of a similar style and appearance. The property is within the Belmont Hill Conservation Area (BHCA) which is characterised as forming a residential area of properties on Belmont Hill, Caterham Road and Boyne Road that display notable historical and architectural detailing and materials across a wide range of styles.

5. The proposed development involves the construction of a dormer window to the existing two-storey outrigger. Due to its location at the rear and side of the property, and the position of the adjacent dwelling, it would not be visible from any significant public vantage points.
6. The appeal statement outlines that the dormer would be finished in zinc cladding which would be an appropriate material to complement the existing roofscape. This would comply with the requirement of the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) that outlines that rear dormer extensions in conservation areas will be required to, amongst other things, use high quality materials, where a contemporary design is more likely to be appropriate.
7. Its siting on the outrigger and its projection by no more than half its length would mean that the dormer would not be visually prominent, nor would it dominate the rear elevation of the property. It would also be set down from the ridge of the outrigger and well-back from the eaves and gable end of the outrigger. As a result, the proposed development would not appear as a bulky or incongruous addition. It would appear subordinate to the host dwelling.
8. In support of the appeal, the appellant has referred to a similar installation at 70 Boyne Road that was allowed on appeal¹. I was able to experience glimpsed views of this installation on my site visit. The similarities between this and the proposed development, combined with the similarity in the type of properties and the fact that both are within the BPCA, are such that the decision is a material consideration of significant weight.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would not cause harm, and would thereby preserve, the character and appearance of the BHCA. It would comply with Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011) and DM Policies 30, 31 and 36 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014). These policies require, amongst other things, that developments conserve the Borough's heritage assets, new development or alterations and extensions to existing buildings are compatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings, scale, form and materials, and be of high-quality design.

Other Matters

10. I have considered the Council's argument that the granting of planning permission would set a precedent for similar developments. Each application and appeal must be determined on its individual planning merits, and a generalised concern of this nature does not justify withholding permission in this case. Given that I have concluded that the proposal would be acceptable, I can see no reason why it would lead to harmful developments on other sites in the area.

¹ APP/C5690/D/16/3165019

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the BHCA, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the submission of details of the external materials that are to be used, including the zinc cladding and fenestration.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR