



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/25/3374533

28 Bousfield Road, Lewisham, London SE14 5TR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Thea Slevin against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/140405.
 - The development proposed is for 2 low profile roof lights to the front elevation roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2 low profile roof lights to the front elevation roof slope at 28 Bousfield Road, Lewisham, London SE14 5TR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/25/140405, and the plans submitted with it, 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: A42_XX_00_DR_A_1001 and A42_XX_00_DR_A_1002

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a Victorian two storey mid terrace house, located in a street made up of terraces of similar properties. These have undergone some extension and alteration but fundamentally retain much of their original form and architectural detailing. The street is located and falls within a character area of the CA recognised for its cohesive spatial and architectural characteristics exemplified by the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part. As such it is recognised in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal as making positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
4. 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 appeal dwelling has been the subject of a previously approved loft conversion with 2 rear dormer windows to the rear roof slope. The proposal is to further improve the quality of the living conditions of the converted loft space through the insertion of a pair of low profile roof lights to the front roof slope. Similar to the existing rear dormers, these would align with the first floor windows. They would also be of a size and scale that would complement the fenestration of the elevation below and would appear proportionate, discreet and subordinate to the appeal dwelling. As such they accord with the design of other approved roof light installations in similar houses in other streets in the CA.
6. Whilst no houses in the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part, or in the street as a whole, have roof lights in the front roof slope, this is not readily apparent in views up and down or across the street due to party wall upstands between pairs of houses. These upstands define the stepping points between the pairs of houses, as the terraces navigate the rising topography of the street towards Arbutnot Road, obscuring views of much of the roofs of houses in the terraces in more tangential views up and down the street.
7. Between these party wall upstands and more evident in straight on views of houses, it is apparent that there has, over time, been re-roofing with a variety of slate types. It is also apparent that roof vents of differing size and design have been inserted into front roof slopes of a significant number of houses in the street, including the appeal dwelling. These demonstrate that the front roof slopes of many of the properties in the street demonstrate a small, but apparent degree of alteration and variation, rather than appearing as unaltered or homogenous in design and materials.
8. Given the limited views of front roof slopes between upstands and the variation and alteration to roof slopes in the street, the absence of roof lights to front roof slopes in the street does not constitute a significant factor in defining the character or appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. Consequently, the proposal would not result in an alteration to the appeal dwelling or roofscape of the area that would be so significant that it would result in any significant detriment or harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the CA and its significance as a heritage asset.
9. The design advice set out in the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD) for roof lights on front roof slopes recommends positioning flush roof lights within the roof slope that align with windows in the elevation below. Which is the case with the proposal. However, the SPD further advises that, if conspicuously located, roof lights can be visually intrusive, alien elements which harm the distinctive character of the host building and diminish its contribution to the special qualities of a conservation area.
10. Such guidance must be applied to the individual context and, for the reasons given. As I find that, although not wholly contained within the middle third of the roof slope, the proposed roof lights would be discretely positioned, with no adverse effect on the character or appearance of the appeal dwelling and would maintain the special qualities of the CA. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the design objectives of the advice and objectives set out in the SPD.
11. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal does not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would preserve that of

the CA. This would accord with Policies QD9, HE1 and HE2 of the Lewisham Local Plan (2025). Collectively these, amongst other matters, seek development that respects and complements the form, proportion, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building and do not cause an incongruous element in terms of the important features of the area's character, avoiding harm to heritage assets and preserving their significance.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, in the interests of design quality I have attached a condition requiring adherence to approved plans.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR