



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3320200

43 Penerley Road, London, SE6 2LH

- 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 Zulfiya Bradley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/128563, dated 23 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of a rear slope roof dormer and side slope dormer along with the implementation of roof lights and solar panels to allow for a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a rear slope roof dormer and side slope dormer along with the implementation of roof lights and solar panels to allow for a loft conversion at 43 Penerley Road, London, SE6 2LH in accordance with the terms of the application ref DC/22/128563, dated 23 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 1) Prior to commencement a detailed schedule and specification of all external materials and finishes and windows roof coverings to be used on the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: B.EX.01, B.EX.02, B.EX.2.1, B.EX.2.2, B.EX.2.3, B.EX.2.4, B.EX.3.1, B.EX.3.2, B.EX.3.3, B.EX.3.4, B.EX.4.1, B.EX.4.2, D.PR.0.1, D.PR.2.1, D.PR.2.2, D.PR.2.3, D.PR.2.4, D.PR.3.1, D.PR.3.2, D.PR.3.3, D.PR.3.4, D.PR.4.1 & D.PR.4.2.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Culverley Green Conservation Area. Under s72 I have a duty under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Area.

3. The Conservation Area covers an area of substantial Edwardian residential properties with a clear street plan, where the houses front the road in a regular pattern. This gives a strong character of built development, with houses being predominately of good quality red brick and steeply pitched roofs and gables, and with trees and garden spaces contributing to the character. The significance of the Area as a heritage asset derives from this regular street plan, and the quality and form of the houses with good landscape character to the roads.
4. The proposals would see alterations to the roof to provide a rear and a side dormer, rooflights and PV panels. Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011, and DM Policies 30, 31 and 36 of the Lewisham Development Management Plan 2014 seek to ensure all development is of a high standard of design that is compatible with the local character of the area, and that conservation areas are preserved or enhanced. The Council have also drawn my attention to the specific guidance for rear roof extension in conservation areas contained in their Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD). This requires such extensions to be of exceptional design quality, high quality materials, to be set in significantly from the eaves and sides, and to be no wider than two thirds of the original roof.
5. The rear dormer in this appeal is shown to be set well-back from the eaves, ridge and the party wall with No. 45. The dormer extends to adjoin the projecting rear gable of the house which, in this instance, I consider acceptable. It is clear to me from the SPD that rear dormers are not ruled out in conservation areas, but rather the Council seeks to control their scale and design; the overall scale of the dormer is not large, due to the set-backs noted above and relative to the scale of the house, but if there was a gap retained between the dormer and the projecting rear gable the dormer would have an awkward relationship with the rest of the roof form due to a clash of the dormer, gap area and the gable.
6. The design of the dormer sees traditional sliding sash windows, the centre of which are positioned to align with the brick pillars beneath. Matching materials are shown to be used, with zinc cladding, which would be suited to the existing property. Thus, when combined with the points above, I consider the rear dormer would be of a suitable siting, scale and design for the house and the wider area.
7. A side dormer is proposed to the roof, to provide access to the converted loft space. The SPD provides guidance on the circumstances in which side roof extensions will be acceptable, and states that in most cases they will be resisted in conservation areas. The proposal is of small scale, positioned behind the chimney to the house and set well back on the roof slope away from the front elevation looking towards the roof of the adjoining house of No. 41. These matters mean there would be very limited visibility of the dormer from public views, and in those views the dormer would be an appropriate design: it is modest in scale, positioned above the first floor window below, with a pitched roof that reflects the pitch of the host property and is set down from the ridgeline.
8. I saw at my site visit there are a number of other properties in the area that have side dormers. These vary in size and design, and I understand that some

of these pre-date the Council's SPD. However, they do not impose upon what constitutes the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and I consider the proposals in this appeal would also be an acceptable change to the property. Hence, in this instance, I consider the side dormer to be an appropriate addition.

9. The rooflights and the solar panels would be changes to the roof that are not imposing upon the building or wider area, due to their limited visibility on the roofs.
10. The proposed alterations and extensions to the property would thus be appropriate to the house and the wider area. The significance of the heritage asset would not be harmed, and hence on the main issue it is concluded the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. The proposals would be consistent with the development plan policies and the SPD referred to earlier.
11. The Council have suggested a number of conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed, to which the appellant has raised no objection. I have attached the suggested condition requiring the submission of details of materials to be used, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a condition specifying the approved plans in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR