

Dulwich Community Council

Monday 26 March 2012

7.00 pm

Dulwich Library, 368 Lordship Lane, London SE22 8NB

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
6.	Development management items – Addendum Report	1 - 7

Agenda Item 6

Item No: 6.	Classification Open	Committee: Dulwich Community Council	Date: 26 March 2012
From: Head of Development Management		Title of Report: <u>Addendum</u> Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions.	

PURPOSE

1. To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and information/revisions received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

2. That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information/revisions received in respect this item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning application on the main agenda:

ITEM 2 Milo Gardens 11/AP/4051

The following further comments have been received since writing the report

39 Beauval Road

The original application was amended to slightly reduce the overall height and bulk of the proposed extension but these revisions do not go far enough to adequately address the concerns set out in my original letter dated 14 January 2012. The Council's report and recommendation fails to properly consider the comments made in my said letter and the recommendation in favour is fundamentally flawed in that there is no proper application of the Residential Design Standards. My supplemental comments for consideration at the Community Council Meeting are as follows.

The Council's Residential Design Standards ("the Standards")

Distance and Outlook

The main breach of the Standards arises out of the fact that the extension to the side of 2 Milo Gardens will not be less than 21 metres from the back of the our property. In the report, the Council have differentiated between distance from the back of what they call "back additions" and distance from the back of the main house. They state that the distance from the back of the main house is 21 metres, but what the Council are calling 'back additions' are in fact part of the original house ie constructed at the same time (reference to photographs previously submitted evidences this). The distance from the proposed development to the rear of our property is only 14.3 metres. There is a clear breach of this particular guidance.

Paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Council's report acknowledge that the development will create added mass and bulk (the side extension will increase in height from 3.4m to 7.5m and the height of the side elevation will increase) but dismisses these concerns as not being "...so harmful to the amenity of these dwellings..." The reality is that there will be a significant and overbearing impact on the outlooks from 37 and 39 Beauval Road. The council is ignoring its own Standard i.e. the requirement of a 21 metres gap. The purpose of this requirement is to regulate overdevelopment in already crowded spaces.

Where these minimum distances cannot be met applicants must provide justification through the Design and Access Statement. The side extension's purpose is to house an external staircase-it is therefore not essential to the development. It could be housed within the original demise. The significant impact on the outlooks for No.37 and 39 outweighs any argument as to the necessity for the side extension.

Design and appearance

The Council's report fails to consider guidance within the Standards as to design and appearance. All extensions should –

- Harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building
- Harmonise with the character of the area, including respecting the historic pattern of the surrounding area
- Be successfully integrated with their surroundings. The extension should read as if it were part of the original dwelling. Where a different approach is taken, the design and composition should be successful. It should retain or restore existing features that are important elements in the townscape or that contribute to the architectural integrity of proportions of a building or group of buildings
- Not unacceptably affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight
- Not be of a size or scale that would visually dominate neighbouring properties
- Be subordinate to the original building. The extension should play a "supporting role" to the original dwelling in terms of location, form and scale. Any extension should not dominate the original building and should be set back from the principal elevations
- Use materials that match those in the original house and the surrounding areas. Windows and doors should be of a similar pattern and align with existing windows and door openings where possible.
- Respect the design and windows features of the host building.

Roof Extensions

Roof design is very important as it will determine the overall shape of an extension. Roof extensions will not be permitted in the following circumstances:

- Where additional floors in any form would harm the architectural integrity of a building or the unity of a group
- Where roof extensions cut through ridge or hip lines
- Where the varied skyline of a terrace or group of buildings is of interest and should be maintained

Conclusion

We remain of the view that the design and size of the proposal is overbearing and the impact is detrimental to our outlook. The development of the side elevation is in breach of the distance Standard.

The design and size of the proposals are unsympathetic to the conservation area and increase the massing.

We ask Dulwich Community Council to reject the Proposal.

37 Beauval Road

Design and appearance

All extensions should

- Harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building
- Harmonise with the character of the area, including respecting the historic pattern of the surrounding area
- Be successfully integrated with their surroundings. The extension should read as if it were part of the original dwelling. Where a different approach is taken, the design and composition should be successful. It should retain or restore existing features that are important elements in the townscape or that contribute to the architectural integrity of proportions of a building or group of buildings
- Not unacceptably affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight
- Not be of a size or scale that would visually dominate neighbouring properties
- Be subordinate to the original building. The extension should play a “supporting role” to the original dwelling in terms of location, form and scale. Any extension should not dominate the original building and should be set back from the principal elevations
- Not compromise any rooms in the existing house. No habitable room should become completely internal without a window
- Use materials that match those in the original house and the surrounding areas. Windows and doors should be of a similar pattern and align with existing windows and door openings where possible.

Side extensions

Side extensions should

- Be subsidiary to the main building
- If the side extension is proposed to be more than single storey, the upper floor should be set back from the side building line
- Have roofs that match those of existing buildings in terms of roof shapes and pitches
- Avoid the infilling of gaps between properties, where this is an important townscape feature.

1. If you look at the diagrams you have given as guidance on page 30 the one clearly marked as wrong is the one most like the proposed extension to number 2 Milo.

2. You state in your report (paragraph 20) that the proposed extension is 14.3m from the **back addition** of the properties directly adjacent to it and 21m from the main dwelling, therefore will not have a significant impact on these properties (37 & 39 Beauval Road.) This gives an unfair impression of the truth - the back of our properties is original and **not an add on** - the only extension to both our properties is an extension of the original kitchen into what was the side alley. Both ourselves and those in number 39 have the kitchen as a family room and spend most of our time in there. Therefore the proposed extension would move the property to only 12meters from what is our main dwelling not 21m and therefore **will** have a large impact on our outlook and amenity.

3. As you state in your next point the proposed extension takes the height from 3.4 to 7.5m - almost double the original height - in another you say that the overall proposed extension does not add considerable bulk to the property - these two statements are contradictory!

4. You state that the plans have been amended however I have spoken to the architects who designed the extension and they have confirmed they have made no reduction in height of the proposed structure - which is what all our concerns relate to. The maintaining of one of the chimney stack is an empty gesture as we will no longer be able to see it as the new flat roof is too high!

5. You also state that there will be no loss of light. That is simply not true! The sun rises to the left of the property in Milo gardens it then is obscured by the existing roof for an hour or so and before it reappears to the right of the property- at this point it give direct sunlight onto our garden for about another hour. The new increased height would block this sun out completely. We are already surrounded by houses and get very little direct light in our garden anyway which makes the growing of any foliage very difficult. This extension would cut out light and will have a direct impact on us.

6. You have given your decision before the end of the consultation period and therefore cannot fully take into account the concerns of the surrounding properties as these have not yet been filed. I did speak to the case officer and she said that we could still raise these concerns at the public meeting – however I am interested to know where that leaves us if we are unable to make this meeting?

I would be grateful if, in light of the above, you would reconsider this decision.

41 Beauval Road

INTRODUCTION

Number 2 Milo Gardens is half of a semi-detached property constructed in the early 1900's with pink fletton brickwork on two floors and located halfway up the gardens of the adjoining properties in Beauval Road.

Expansion of this intrusive development needs to be considered exceedingly carefully so as not to impose even further loss of amenity for the surrounding buildings in Beauval Road particularly number 41 Beauval Road.

Currently the application being put forward lacks a measure of understanding and sympathy for the neighbours and does not follow the design and scale of the other half to this pair of properties which places it at odds with the local buildings and amenities.

REASONS FOR OBJECTION

1. The Design and Access statement states that this property is "hidden away in the middle of a block of rear gardens, so that at no point is it seen from the public realm" The fact that this original house is in the middle of the rear gardens requires a greater degree of consideration and sensitivity for the houses whose rear gardens are to be overlooked. Those who live in Beauval Road, would be forced to live with this increased slab of ugly pink fletton bricks right on top of them if the current proposal were to be approved.
2. It has been claimed that there would be little or no disruption to the other people dwelling adjacent. This is a far cry from the truth because the enlarged monolithic slab of the side wall facing the houses in Beauval Road will reduce daylight and sunlight and present a substantial increase in size to a very unattractive facade of brickwork.
3. The existing brickwork is a very raw pink fletton brick and the proposal refers to the brickwork matching existing brickwork with yellow London stocks. This is a complete contradiction as the existing brickwork would require the new structure to be formed with raw pink fletton bricks. If stocks are to be used this would create a very unpleasant piebald mix of colours and enhance the element of massing and the overbearing nature of the proposals.
4. Massing of the proposed structure will be out of keeping with what was originally a pair of cottages, albeit not located originally with a great deal of consideration for the surrounding properties.
5. The proposals will be overbearing in relation to the privacy and amenities of the adjacent gardens especially number 41 Beauval Road where the complete garden will be laid bare to any inquisitive eyes from the third floor of the proposed development.
6. It is claimed that the proposals will be "sensitive to the neighbours" which is a completely unsupportable claim as this proposal is totally intrusive without any care or concern for the neighbours. So abrasive and inconsiderate is the scheme, that it does not even attempt to follow the fenestration lines of the adjoin house but imposes a full height elevation of glass 4 metres wide by some 2.2metres in height across the third floor level.

7. The rear of the property at third floor level has been designed as a panoramic set of doors extending from floor to ceiling behind a Juliet balcony. These doors are designed to allow them to be folded back if desired allowing a wholesale and uninterrupted view of the complete garden area of number 41.
8. There is no precedence whatsoever for this style of design in this location. It is claimed that the design is based upon that which was constructed at number 1 Milo Gardens but this is a totally fallacy as number 1 does not have full height doors across the complete rear elevation at roof/third floor level.
9. A clear glazed façade across the whole rear elevation will entirely destroy the privacy, enjoyment and amenity value of the rear garden of number 41 Beauval Road. Any use of the rear garden will be akin to being in a goldfish bowl with all and any movement or action being observed and scrutinised from on high.
10. There are roof lights into this third floor bedroom which in themselves would produce enough natural light to satisfy the various design requirements. Whilst it is accepted that windows may be preferable to having only roof lights there is no additional advantage gained by extending the glazing from floor to ceiling across the complete width of the room.
11. The proposal would not be ruined or diminished in any way if the lower part of the fenestration on the top floor of the rear elevation were to be omitted so that the design matches that of the adjoining property and reduces the impact of a total glass facade at third floor level that destroys the privacy and amenity of the rear garden of number 41 Beauval Road.

CONCLUSIONS

It is our view that the design and size of the proposal is overbearing and will have a unpleasant detrimental affect on the amenity and privacy of a quiet residential area.

It is our contention that the design and size of the proposals are unsympathetic by unnecessarily increasing the degree of massing.

It lacks architectural merit and is simply a monolithic sheet of plain glass.

It makes no attempt to fit in with the surrounding area both as soft private garden gardens or any of the architectural features of the other half of a pair of simple artisan dwellings.

Finally, it will have a grossly adverse and detrimental affect on the amenity and privacy of number 41 Beauval Road as well as the other houses in Beauval Road.

In view of the above, we ask that the Council **reject the proposals for the side, rear addition and rear roof extension for this property.**

REASON FOR LATENESS

4. The comments reported above have all been received since the agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

REASON FOR URGENCY

5. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the Sub-Committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications/enforcements and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

6. These are contained in the report.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

7. These are contained in the report.

LOCAL AGENDA 21 (Sustainable Development) IMPLICATIONS

8. These are contained in the report.

Lead Officer: Gary Rice, Head of Development Management

Background Papers: Individual case files.

Located at: Deputy Chief Executive's Department, Council Offices, 160 Tooley Street, SE1.