

## **Heritage Statement**

### **Site - 175 Sheen Lane, East Sheen, London, SW14 8LE**

### **Proposal - Alterations to roof including 2 additional side dormers**

## **Introduction**

The site is in CA64 Sheen Lane, East Sheen Conservation Area therefore in order to maintain the existing street scene it is essential to preserve as many of the existing heritage features that contribute positively to the character of the original building and wider conservation.

The proposal both respects the Sheen Lane, East Sheen Conservation Area character and is subservient to the host building being located to the side of the main building at 175 Sheen Lane.

The existing roof valleys this application seeks to alter are not an feature of the originally constructed dwelling house

## **POLICIES**

### **DESIGN POLICIES**

Section 16 of the NPPF deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Paragraph 193 states that: "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation."

Paragraph 196 states: "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."

Paragraph 197 states: "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."

Local Plan policy LP 1 seeks to protect areas of high quality, such as this conservation area, from inappropriate development. All new development should recognise distinctive local character and contribute to creating places of a high architectural and urban design quality that are well used and valued, be sustainable, respect the space between buildings and relationship with the public realm and use appropriate detailing and materials.

Local Plan policy LP 3 seeks to protect and, where possible, enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Local Plan policy LP 4 seeks to protect the character, appearance and setting of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

The SPD on 'House Extensions and External Alterations' states that side and rear extensions should be subservient to and in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building.

### **Detailed Assessment**

Sheen Lane is described in the Sheen Lane (East Sheen) Conservation Area 64 statement as: *"The cohesiveness of the area is provided by the linear feel of buildings of similar height, punctuated by key focal buildings of different styles and heights all fronting the ancient highway of Sheen Lane."*

The main buildings frontage is to remain unaltered. This dwelling has however had its original form, periodically extended and altered and includes the valley roof forms now sought to be removed by this proposal.



IMAGE 1  
Sheen Lane frontage

The side of the building is only partly visible from Sheen Lane and this imposes a visual compromise

on the regular well considered detailed design of the host main building and adjacent dwelling houses lying to the south of the application site. The proposal seeks to enhance the compromises to create a subservience through being referenced by the lower rear ridge height (which is considerably lower than the visually dominant front ridge) through the resulting visual cohesion created by the infilling of the valleys resulting from the 60's rear extension.

The area is characterised by 3, & 4 level buildings built about 100 years ago, opposite the site on the north side of Sheen Lane, whilst 2/3 storey buildings are located in the other directions around this site.

The existing link rear extensions and resulting valley gutters are not considered to positively contribute to the character of the conservation area bringing compromise to the prevailing order and enhanced visual amenity of the rest of the street frontage.

The existing lower rear ridge height is maintained with the side extension infill proposed. The current application adds no material height to the original subservient height of the 1960's rear extension being significantly lower than both the host main building's ridge and the adjacent dwellings to the south.

The proposal has been designed to achieve a continuing roof slope profile and then to integrate the roof of the further extensions proposed in a manner that reflects the context of the site.

The appearance has been carefully composed to utilise traditional tiles and rendered London stock bricks with painted timber joinery. It has also been designed in a way to respond to the distinctive and unique features of its location which will dilute the negative visual aspects of the pre-existing forms which are not without their own visual amenity compromises.

The proposal is to the roof level only. The topography of the site, gently sloping south to north and west to east. The proposal is clearly to remain subservient to the main building.

## **Materials**

A tiled roof, would match the existing and be secured by condition. The semi crown rear elements at the lower ridge heights will be in a traditional lead finish but will not be visible from the public domain. Detailing on the frontage will be repeated on the sides and rear which will clearly still contribute positively to the appearance of the conservation area. This means the proposals will enhance the character, visual cohesion or appearance of the conservation area to a point where we suggest that no objection could be sustained. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies LP 1, LP 3 and LP 4 and the SPD and all noted NPPF policy requirements.

## **Conclusion**

The proposals are subservient to the host building.

Although the design is not a repetition of the host buildings appearance, its scale and material choices ensure it defines its identity in a manner that is subservient to the host buildings identity and blends with this building through the sympathetic material choices and its much smaller scale.

**Donald Shearer RIBA ARB**