



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/22/3308820

68 Manor Lane, Lewisham, London SE13 5QP

- 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 Mrs Kelly Warren against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/127048, dated 1 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a roof extension to the rear roof slope together with the installation of rooflights in the front roof slope and replacement double glazed timber sash windows to the rear elevation and removal of render from rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a roof extension to the rear roof slope together with the installation of rooflights in the front roof slope and replacement double glazed timber sash windows to the rear elevation and removal of render from rear elevation at 68 Manor Lane, Lewisham, London SE13 5QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/127048, dated 1 June 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:
 - PL01 (Site Block Plan)
 - PL02 (Proposed First Floor Plan)
 - PL03 (Proposed Second Floor Plan)
 - PL04 (Proposed Roof Plan)
 - PL05 (Proposed Front Elevation)
 - PL06 (Proposed Rear Elevation)
 - PL07 (Proposed Elevations Side from No 66 & 70)
 - PL08 (Proposed Section 1-1 & 2-2)

Preliminary Matter

2. In the banner heading, I have referred to the description of the development set out in the Council's decision notice, omitting any text which is unnecessary

to accurately describe the proposed development. This describes the proposal more precisely than that contained within the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lee Manor Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the northern portion of the CA, with its boundary running along the western edge of the site. The host dwelling is illustrative of the two-storey traditional terraced properties with various period features that characterise the immediate area.
5. Local finishing materials are predominantly yellow stock brick and slate grey roofs, with the first floor render to the rear of the host dwelling unique among its immediate neighbours. Mid-terrace properties, including No 68, typically feature a parapet wall and chimneys along shared boundaries at roof level. In traditional proportions, materials and arrangements, the dwellings along this part of Manor Lane, including No 68, contribute to the significance and overall visual and historic coherence of the CA.
6. Nevertheless, contemporary additions can be found throughout the CA and wider area. North of Chalcroft Road, within the CA, large roof extensions to the rear of dwellings along Manor Lane are a ubiquitous feature, though their prominence from public vantage points varies. While similar in size, these often also vary in their design approach and finish. Some are of a higher quality of design than others. All are unmistakably later additions, distinguishable by their more contemporary appearance and form.
7. South of Chalcroft Road, large roof extensions to the rear of dwellings along Manor Lane are less common, though still observable. In particular, the terrace in which the host dwelling is located features a large contemporary roof extension at one end, at 64 Manor Lane, and a more modest dormer window at the other, at 78 Manor Lane.
8. The appeal proposal would include the construction of a large roof extension to the rear. Due to its position, it would have no appreciable impact on the street scene along Manor Lane. I saw on my site visit however that the rear roof slopes of dwellings along this part of Manor Lane, including No 68, can be clearly observed from Chalcroft Road and Thornwood Road.
9. The Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document Adopted April 2019 (SPD) sets out guidance for rear dormers and rear roof extensions, the latter concerning more considerable additions. In conservation areas, the SPD indicates exceptional design quality and high-quality materials must be demonstrated. It advocates roof extensions be set in significantly from the eaves, ridge and sides and no wider than two thirds of the original roof.
10. The SPD also advises however that a modern, high-quality design is generally more successful when considering a large rear roof extension, being more likely to contrast with the property and maintain the original integrity of the dwelling. It seeks to ensure proposals do not contribute to a group of mismatched roof forms by taking into consideration neighbouring roof extensions. Additionally, the SPD recognises that there will be schemes that fall outside of its context,

where a reasonable and pragmatic approach will be taken. It also supports innovative and creative solutions that exhibit high quality design and detailing.

11. The proposed roof extension is of contemporary design and would occupy most of the width of the rear roof slope. However, the parapet walls to either side and the chimney along the boundary with 66 Manor Lane would be retained. It would also not extend beyond the ridge line of the original roof. The use of large glazing panels, modern materials and a flat roof would deviate from the traditional architecture of the original dwelling. However, the proposal is otherwise of a high-quality design and the use of a significant amount of glazing, set back within chamfered reveals, would prevent it from having an unduly bulky or harmful top-heavy appearance.
12. The contemporary approach to the design of the proposed roof extension is like that of its close neighbours at 62 and 64 Manor Lane and its appearance is particularly comparable to that of No 64. While both of these nearby dwellings are end-terrace, rather than mid-terrace, their extensions are also of an overtly modern nature, are prominently located and are of a high standard of design. They therefore positively contribute to the character and appearance of the immediate area. The proposal would therefore represent continuity of design and consistency in the quality and finish of this type of large roof extension locally. In this context, it would not appear unduly incongruous or obtrusive.
13. As is recognised in the SPD, contemporary design and historic forms are not inherently inimical, and I consider the former would sit comfortably relative to the latter in this instance, particularly given its immediate context. The proposed roof extension would therefore not detract from the prevailing features of the host dwelling or the character and appearance of the area.
14. My attention has been drawn to an appeal (ref: APP/C5690/D/18/3216907) at 74 Manor Lane, for the construction of a rear roof extension, that was dismissed in April 2019. This mid-terrace dwelling sits within the same row as the appeal property. The full details of the case are not before me however I note from the decision that the Inspector in that case found the proposal to be overly bulky and dominant, which I have not found in this instance. Notably, the decision was also made prior to the approval and implementation of the contemporary dormer at No 64 and the adoption of the SPD. It was therefore considered in a different context and in view of different local guidance. Ultimately, each case must be considered on its own merits, and that decision does not lead me to a different conclusion on this main issue.
15. While the smaller of the proposed front facing rooflights is not aligned with the window below, given its modest size and elevated position it would be relatively inconspicuous. I therefore do not consider that this would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. I note this also did not form part of the Council's reason for refusal.
16. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Lee Manor Conservation Area (CA). It would therefore accord with the clear expectations of statute in this respect¹.
17. It would also be in accordance with Policy HC1 of The London Plan March 2021, Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Core

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted June 2011 and DM Policies 30, 31 and 36 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan Adopted 26 November 2014. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure the significance of heritage assets is conserved and conservation areas are protected from inappropriate development. They also require extensions to existing buildings to be of a high, site specific and sensitive design quality, and not adversely affect the architectural integrity of a group of buildings or appear incongruous or obtrusive.

18. The proposal would also comply with Part 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, in respect of its aims of conserving and enhancing the historic environment, as well as relevant guidance within Section 5.8 of the SPD, for the reasons set out in detail above.

Conditions

19. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. Finishing materials are articulated on the proposed plans and are therefore secured by the approved plans condition.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR