

Eltham & Kidbrooke Area Planning Committee 26th October 2021	Agenda Item: 6 Reference No: 21/0942/HD
--	--

Applicant: Mr Curtis, 79 Lee Road, Lewisham, SE3 9EN
Agent: Mr Harry, Planning & Part Wall Specialists Ltd, 39 Shirley Way, Shirley, Croydon CR0 8PJ

Site Address: 79 Lee Road, Lewisham, London SE3 9EN	Ward: Middle Park and Sutcliffe Application Type: Full Planning Permission
---	---

1.0 Recommendation

1.1 The Committee is requested to grant Planning Permission Ref. 21/0942/HD as outlined below:

‘Amalgamation of existing outbuildings with the main property to form a ground floor rear extension with associated external works.’

Recommendation:

- i. To resolve to grant conditional planning permission according to the conditions in Appendix 2, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- ii. To Authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

2.0 Summary

2.1 Detailed below is a summary of the application:

The Site -	
Site Area (m ²)	1392m ²
Heritage Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locally listed building • Blackheath Park Conservation Area
Tree Preservation Order	N/A
Flood Risk Zone	Zone 1 (least probability of flooding)

The Proposal	
The application proposes the amalgamation of existing outbuildings with main property to form ground floor rear extension with associated external works	

Public Consultation	
Number in support	1
Number of objections	8
Number of comments	0
Main issues raised by objectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and appearance • Impact on heritage assets • Overlooking • Misuse of planning regulations • Flood risk

- 2.2 The application is being reported to the Eltham & Kidbrooke Area Planning Committee due to the number of objections received, and that Cllr Drury has requested that the application be considered at committee should the application be recommended for approval.
- 2.3 The report details all relevant national, regional and local policy implications of the scheme, including supplementary planning guidance.
- 2.4 The application is considered acceptable and is recommended for approval, subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 2.

3.0 Site and surroundings (in detail)

- 3.1 The application site is rectangular in shape and comprises a semi-detached dwelling with a large rear garden located on the eastern side of Lee Road. The site shares its boundaries with No. 77 Lee Road to the north, No. 81 to the south and No. 13 Manor Way to the east.
- 3.2 The subject site contains a number of well-established trees and vegetation. It is located in a residential area with the Kid Brook running along the northern side boundary.

3.3 The site is located within the Blackheath Park Conservation Area and the subject dwelling and its adjoining semi-detached pair (No. 81 Lee Road) are locally listed buildings with the following entry,

'Built 1827. Paired villas; 2-storeys and attic. Stuccoed fronts to main parts. Side walls and later extension painted brick. Slated roof of moderate pitch, with gable end to road. Parapet fronts to extensions. On ground floor, canted bay, with sloping slate roof. Six panel door with high, rectangular fanlight in flat stuccoed surround with keystone supporting first floor band. No. 81 has shutters to windows.'

3.4 From the front the pair are not symmetrical or a mirror image of one another but rather they read as one large dwelling. To the rear the pair would have originally been symmetrical; however previous alterations and extensions are evident.

3.5 The neighbouring properties at Nos. 77 and 83 Lee Road are Grade II listed.

3.6 The site is located within Flood Zone I (least likelihood of flooding).



Figure 1: Site Plan

4.0 Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

Planning

- 4.1 A lawful development certificate was refused for the construction of a single storey rear extension, under planning reference 19/1184/CP, dated 17th May 2019.
- 4.2 A lawful development certificate was approved for partial demolition of a rear extension and construction of two outbuildings, under planning reference 19/3374/CP, dated 20th November 2019.
- 4.3 Planning permission was refused for the construction of a 2-storey side extension including new front porch, single storey rear extension, enlargement of first floor rear terrace, new door and window to side elevation and side dormer to roofslope, under planning reference 18/3608/HD, dated 4th December 2018. The subsequent planning appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed (reference APP/E5330/D/19/3223563, dated 3rd July 2019).
- 4.4 Planning permission was approved for replacing 3 single glazed sash windows with double glazed box sash windows with glazing bars, replacement of 3 single glazed with double glazed into existing frames and removed single glazed casement windows with double glazed casement windows with glazing bars, under planning reference 20/1048/HD, dated 03rd December 2020.
- 4.5 Planning permission was approved for the enlargement of existing two storey side extension including finishes to match existing. Installation of replacement windows to front elevation and removal of ground floor side window, under planning reference 20/1350/HD, dated 17th December 2020.
- 4.6 Planning permission was approved for the enlargement of existing side dormer, under planning reference 20/1351/HD, dated 22nd December 2020.
- 4.7 An application under planning reference 21/1977/MA is currently under consideration and is submitted under Section 73 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for a minor material amendment and in connection with the planning permission 20/1351/HD, dated 22/12/2020 to allow:
 - Enlargement of approved dormer roof extension
- 4.8 Planning permission was approved for the construction of two side dormer windows to main roof, under planning reference 21/1603/HD, dated 28th July 2021.

Enforcement

- 4.9 A planning enforcement complaint was received under reference: E/20/2098 for the non-compliance of development with the approved plans under planning reference: 19/3374/CP. This case was fully investigated and closed on 1st February 2021.
- 4.10 A planning enforcement complaint was received under reference: E/20/0667 for works to be carried out involving the demolition of a boundary wall. This case was fully investigated and closed on 10th November 2020.

5.0 Proposals (in detail)

Background

- 5.1 In 2018, an application for the construction of a 2-storey side extension including new front porch, single storey rear extension, enlargement of first floor rear terrace, new door and window to side elevation and side dormer to roofslope, under planning reference 18/3608/HD, was refused on the following grounds:
- 1. The proposed development, by reason of its inappropriate scale, bulk and design, would dominate and compete with the appearance of the host property and would unbalance the semi-detached pair, which together in their existing state provide special local architectural and historic interest and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Blackheath Park Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of both designated and non-designated heritage assets and as such it is contrary to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraphs 196 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), Policies DH1, DH(a), DH(h) and DH(j) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2016) and the Blackheath Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2013).*
 - 2. Due to the size and extent of the proposed rear extension along the boundary shared with no. 81 Lee Road, the proposal would be overbearing and create an unacceptable a sense of enclosure for the occupants of 81 Lee Road. Furthermore, the proposed roof terrace above the rear extension would promote overlooking of windows of the neighbouring property at 81 Lee Road and reduce their privacy to an unacceptable degree. This is contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016),*

Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2014).

3. *The proposed side extension would encroach within 5 metres of the Kid Brook, which flows in culvert along the northern boundary of the site. As a result, the proposal would further restrict access to the culvert for essential maintenance and emergency repairs, which is imperative in reducing flood risk to the property and those in the surrounding area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (2016) and policy E2 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).*
4. *In the absence of a Tree Survey, the Council is unable to make a full analysis of the potential impact of the proposed development on the protected trees and the local environment generally. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 7.8, 7.19 and 7.21 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH1, DH(h) and OS(f) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).*

5.2 The subsequent planning appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed (reference APP/E5330/D/19/3223563, dated 3rd July 2019). The Inspector was of the opinion that,

“The single storey rear addition would be excessively deep with a large expanse of flat roof which would detract from the appeal property’s original character and proportions. Whilst the proposed materials would match that existing and replicate some existing features on the property, the extensions proposed would be neither subservient nor sympathetic to the host dwelling. Although the rear extension would only be visible in private views this would not diminish the harm that would be caused.” (paragraph 7)

“The disproportionate design of the proposed extensions would create an excessive bulk that has little relationship to the existing dwelling or examples in the identified group of which the appeal property forms part. As a result, the extensions would be incongruous and cause harm to the architectural integrity of the existing locally listed building and the character and appearance of the CA.” (paragraph 9)

5.3 In 2019, a lawful development certificate was refused for the construction of a single storey rear extension, under planning reference 19/1184/CP on the following grounds:

1. *The proposed single storey rear extension would be within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, and the height of the eaves would measure 3.3 metres, exceeding requirement A.1(i). As such, the proposal does not*

comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

2. *The proposed single storey rear extension would attach to previously erected side and rear extensions, and as such, the total enlargement (being the proposed extension together with any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which it would be joined) would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse and would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. As such, the proposal does not comply with requirements A.1(j) and A.1(ja) of Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).*
3. *The proposal includes the provision of a verandah/balcony on the roof of the proposed single storey rear extension. Notwithstanding that a verandah/balcony already exists, the provision of this verandah/balcony would conflict with requirement A.1(k)(i) of Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).*

5.4 A follow-up lawful development certificate for the partial demolition of a rear extension and construction of two outbuildings (ancillary storage and private gym), was submitted later in 2019 and subsequently granted under planning reference 19/3374/CP.

5.5 The certificate was granted following a review of recent appeal decisions (e.g. appeal references APP/Y3615/X/17/3181457 and APP/F5540/X/18/3209860) which make it clear that any gap between a house and a proposed outbuilding, even if that gap is minimal, requires the local planning authority to make an assessment against Class E (rather than Class A). For appeal reference APP/Y3615/X/17/3181457, the Inspector stated:

"The application drawings show a freestanding building which would be physically separate from the dwellinghouse. There is nothing within the GPDO or indeed the accompanying Technical Guidance which lends support to an argument that there has to be a "material" gap between the two buildings nor does the Council indicate what it considers a material gap to be. The Technical Guidance makes clear that "Buildings which are attached to the house (my emphasis added) are not permitted under Class E (they would be subject to the rules in Class A)". The building would not be attached to the house as a matter of fact.

The Council has provided no other evidence which lends support to its particular interpretation that there has to be a material gap between the buildings in order to be able to assess the development against Class E. Further, it has failed to respond

to the example appeal decisions provided by the Appellant where Inspectors have consistently found that small gaps between buildings (even smaller than that proposed here) have not excluded developments from being considered under Class E. I have been provided with no reason why I should depart from the consistent reasoning of my colleagues in those decisions which seem to me to correctly follow the provisions and wording of the GPDO."

- 5.6 It is for these reasons and in light of the appeal decisions that the LDC was granted as the proposed structure fell within the limits of permitted development as set out in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). This development has since been implemented.

Scope of application

- 5.7 Following the grant of the 2019 lawful development certificate the current planning application is for the conversion of and the amalgamation of the existing outbuildings with main property to form a ground floor rear extension with associated external works.
- 5.8 The proposal would infill the gaps in between the existing outbuildings (800mm) and rear of the dwelling house (200mm) and the extension will be used as a new kitchen. There will be no increase in depth.
- 5.9 Full height retractable glass doors will be installed to the rear and side elevations.
- 5.10 The proposed materials are a combination of white stucco render and London stock bricks to match.
- 5.11 The north-eastern corner of the extension would feature a fully demountable floor of 12.6sqm which allows a section of the corner to be removed and the glazed screens retracted to result in a L-shaped extension. This is to allow the Environment Agency full access to the culvert situated within approximately 8m of the side of the property

6.0 Consultation

- 6.1 The application since being registered in April 2021 has been subject to public consultation.
- 6.2 The consultation involved the following:

- **4** neighbour consultation letters were sent to the occupiers of the adjoining properties on the **15/04/2021**;
- **1** site notice was displayed at the site on **22/04/2021** and a press notice issued on the **21/04/2021**; and
- **3** amenity groups (The Blackheath Cator Estate Residents Ltd, The Blackheath Society and The Blackheath Park Conservation Group) were consulted on **14/04/2021**.

6.3 Statutory Consultees

6.3.1. A summary of the consultation responses received along with the officer comments are set out in table below:

Details of Representation	Summary of Comments	Officer's comments
Internal		
Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The existing single-storey rear additions are unsympathetic to the historic property but, at single-storey, are subservient to the host building in mass and scale;</i> • <i>The proposals do not substantially increase the built footprint of the building beyond that of the existing additions remain subservient in mass and scale;</i> • <i>The proposed large, unrelieved glazed retractable sliding screens introduce an alien and unsympathetic feature to the historic property which gives undue prominence to the extension and causes harm to the character and appearance of the locally listed building. Whilst this might be considered less than substantial in planning terms, there are no benefits arising from the proposals to outweigh this;</i> 	Noted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As such, the proposals do not accord with National (NPPF 189, 190, 197), London (HC1C) and Local Policies (DH3, DH(h), DH(j)) and approval of the application is not supported. 	
External		
The Environment Agency	No objection subject to the imposition of a compliance condition and a flood risk activity permit informative.	The suggested condition and informative has been recommended to be attached to the decision.
The Blackheath Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design and appearance Impact on heritage assets Overlooking, reduced daylight and overbearing Flood risk 	Noted.

6.4 Local Residents

6.5 Four (4) neighbouring properties were notified as part of this application. 8 letters of objection were received following the initial consultation on 14th April 2021.

6.5.1. A summary of the consultation responses received along with the officer comments are set out in table below:

Summary of Comments	Officer's comments
Design and impact on heritage assets	The acceptability of the design and impact on heritage assets is set out in the Design section of the main report
Amenity impact	The effect on neighbouring amenity is set out in the Amenity section of the main report.
Flood risk	Flood risk matters are set out in the Flooding section of the main report.
Misuse of planning regulations	The application has to be assessed on its individual planning merits and against current adopted policies and guidance.

7.0 Planning Context

7.1 This application needs to be considered in the context of a range of national, regional and local planning policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents.

- **National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF” - 2021)**
- **The London Plan (2021)** - Full details of relevant policies refer to Appendix 3.
- **The Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (“Core Strategy” - 2014)** - Full details of relevant policies refer to Appendix 3.

7.2 For full details of relevant SPD / Documents refer to Appendix 3.

8.0 Planning Considerations

8.1 The planning considerations relevant to this application are as follows:

- Principle of development;
- Design;
- Neighbouring amenity;
- Flood Risk; and
- CIL

Principle of Development

8.2 The overriding objective of the Royal Greenwich policy framework is to deliver high quality development which improves the quality and distinctive identity of places and contributes to their success and the area’s popularity as somewhere to live, work and stay.

8.3 As such, it is acknowledged that extensions to existing dwelling houses can facilitate additional and enhanced living spaces for improved living conditions for occupants. They are therefore considered acceptable in principle subject to ensuring a high-quality neighbourly design and no significant amenity loss is created. These matters are considered in the rest of this report.

Design and impact on heritage assets

8.4 The site is located within the Blackheath Park Conservation Area (designated heritage asset) and the subject dwelling and its adjoining semi-detached pair

(No. 81 Lee Road) are locally listed buildings (non-designated heritage assets). Further, the neighbouring properties at No. 77 and 83 Lee Road are Grade II listed (designated heritage assets). As such the impact on the setting and special character on these identified heritage assets is a key assessment in determining the acceptability of the development proposals.

8.5 The entry for the locally listed buildings (subject site) is as follows,

'Built 1827. Paired villas; 2-storeys and attic. Stuccoed fronts to main parts. Side walls and later extension painted brick. Slated roof of moderate pitch, with gable end to road. Parapet fronts to extensions. On ground floor, canted bay, with sloping slate roof. Six panel door with high, rectangular fanlight in flat stuccoed surround with keystone supporting first floor band. No. 81 has shutters to windows.'

8.6 Chapter 16 of the NPPF identifies the significance of heritage assets and places an importance on their conservation. Paragraph 199 states that when assessing planning applications affecting heritage assets, great weight should be placed on their conservation, with clear and convincing justification being required for any harm to, or loss of, the assets significance (paragraph 200). This follows the statutory requirement, under section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; requires paying a special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the relevant listed building and conservation area. This principle is supported by the Policy HCI of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH3 and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014).

8.7 For non-designated heritage assets paragraph 203 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage assets should be taken into account and a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset. Policy DH(j) of the Royal Greenwich local Plan Core Strategy states that substantial weight will be given to protecting and conserving the particular characteristics that account for the designation of buildings on the local list. Consequently, proposals for unsympathetic alteration will be strongly discouraged.

8.8 Policy DH1 of the Core Strategy requires proposals to be of a high quality, which should positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environment. The local scale, the established pattern of development and landscape, building form and materials will all be taken into account. This is supported by Policy D3 in the London Plan (2021). Policy DH(a) of the

Core Strategy states that proposals for rear, side and other additions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

- 8.9 The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions SPD (2018) set out the design recommendations for extensions namely:
- no part of the extension (including the guttering and foundations) crosses the boundary line;
 - a flat roof will frequently be acceptable for a single storey rear extension. However, there may be instances where a rear proposal would be seen between or over other properties in the street, in which case a pitched roof would be preferred.
- 8.10 The application seeks to consolidate the 2 existing outbuildings granted under the 2019 lawful development certificate into a single ground floor rear extension.
- 8.11 Officers take the view that the only proposed external changes are minor in nature and involve the proposed infilling of the 800mm gap in between the 2 outbuildings and the 200mm space between the outbuildings and existing ground floor rear outrigger. Importantly, the infill proposal of 4.7sqm does not substantially increase the gross internal area of the existing development and the overall depth would be maintained. In fact, the demountable corner of 12.6sqm when the glazed screens are in their fully retractable positions would result in a smaller amount of development compared to the existing. Regardless of whether the demountable corner is removed the overall scale and massing of the new extension is similar to the existing outbuildings and that being the case the development proposals would remain subservient and respectful to the host property and in context of the site which benefits from a deep rear garden.
- 8.12 The ground floor rear extension will have a flat-roofed design which would be acceptable in this instance as its location would not have any open public views. The proposed materials are a combination of white stucco render and London stock bricks to match which are satisfactory as they would complement the existing building. These materials are recommended to be secured by condition for any planning approval.
- 8.13 It is noted that the Council's Conservation Officer has raised an objection to the proposed large, glazed retractable sliding screens. However, the screens to which they are to be installed will be limited to the ground floor and rear of the property which has no public vantage points and as such cannot be seen from any surrounding roads and only from private gardens of the

neighbouring properties. Indeed, the full height glazed screen panels are large in design, but they have been intentionally designed to be in contrast to the pastiche appearance of the host dwelling house as the extension is contemporary in its outward appearance and therefore no design and heritage concerns are raised in respect to this.

- 8.14 On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and significance of the host locally listed property, the setting of the adjacent listed buildings or the wider conservation area and overall is considered to be consistent with the relevant policy framework and legislation.

Neighbouring amenity

- 8.15 Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policy (2014) Policy DH(b) states that developments will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an un-neighbourly sense of enclosure.
- 8.16 From a review of the site and the surrounding context, it is considered that the relevant properties for the consideration of amenity impacts are:
- No. 77 Lee Road (to the north); and
 - No. 81 Lee Road (to the south).
- 8.17 The adjoining semi-detached pair at No. 81 Lee Road has been extended at the rear along its southern boundary with an undeveloped piece of land against the common boundary it shares with the application site. The proposal would not project beyond the rear extent of the existing building and therefore there will be no new amenity impacts in terms of daylight/sunlight and outlook or enclosure to the occupiers of this neighbouring property. There are no openings to this side of the extension so no loss of privacy will occur.
- 8.18 Likewise, and in terms of impact on No. 77 Lee Road the extension would follow the footprint of the existing building albeit infilling the small gaps in between the existing development. The new extension would be offset between 1.7m at its closest point and 2.4m at its widest from the boundary and would introduce large glazed screen to its side and rear elevations. However, there will be no new overlooking effects as the existing boundary would be maintained and the nearest ground floor rear-facing habitable window is located some 11m away. In addition, there are existing ground

floor side windows that are positioned in this direction, thus the proposed development would maintain the living conditions currently enjoyed by the residents at 77 Lee Road.

- 8.19 Overall the development is considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity and therefore complies with Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy.

Flood Risk

- 8.20 Paragraph 167 of the NPPF states that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Criterion C of Policy SI 12 of London Plan cites that development proposals should ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated, and that residual risk is addressed. This should include, where possible, making space for water and aiming for development to be set back from the banks of watercourses. Policy E2 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) states that flood risk assessments must be prepared which address the risk of flooding to the development and identify options to mitigate the flood risk to the development, site users and the surrounding area.
- 8.21 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 (least likelihood of flooding) and is less than 1ha in size. Accordingly, no Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required as part of the planning application. However, the flood risk of the site is informed by the presence of the Kid Brook along the northern boundary which runs in a culvert under the subject site but not the property itself. The culverting of the Kid Brook can be viewed as a type of flood defence, the access to which is important to enable the Environment Agency to undertake works to it in an emergency as well as routine maintenance.
- 8.22 The EA has been consulted on the application and they have raised no objection subject to the imposition of a compliance condition to ensure the working space for any future maintenance or replacement to the Kid Brook is not impeded by the new development. It is also noted the development is set off from the northern boundary and corner of the extension has been designed to be de-mountable to facilitate easy access to the culvert beneath the site which is a betterment over the existing site arrangement. As such, subject to the imposition of the condition the development would not affect the future maintenance and culverting of the Kid Brook and be in accordance with Policy SI 12 of London Plan (2021) and Policy E2 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

CIL

- 8.23 The new extension would be less than 100sqm in floor area, and as such the proposal would not be liable for the Mayoral CIL2 and the Royal Borough of Greenwich CIL.

Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and Human Rights

- 8.24 Under the Equalities Act 2010, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation of persons by reason of age, disability, pregnancy, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation. This planning application has been processed and assessed with due regard to the PSED. The application proposals are not considered to conflict with the Duty.
- 8.25 The application has also been considered in the light of the Human Rights Act 1998 and it is considered that the analysis of the issues in this case, as set out in this report and recommendation, is compatible with the Act.

Conclusion

- 8.26 The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle as it would not have an impact on the character or significance of the non-designated and designated heritage assets in the locality or give rise to any un-neighbouring amenity effects to the adjoining properties. The proposal also would not lead to any increased flooding in the area.
- 8.27 Based on the above, it is therefore recommended that permission be granted for application reference 21/0942/HD, subject to the conditions outlined in Appendix 2.

Background Papers: National Planning Policy Framework (2021)
The London Plan (2021)
Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014)
Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions
Guidance SPD (2018)

Report Author: Aaron Lau – Senior Principal Planner
Tel No.: 0208 921 8907
Email: Aaron.Lau@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan - Assistant Director Planning &
Building Control

Tel No.:

0208 921 4296

Email:

Victoria.Geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk