

<b>Item No.</b> 6.3	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 28 July 2011	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Dulwich Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-1034 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 21 GILKES CRESCENT, LONDON, SE21 7BP  <b>Proposal:</b> Erection of two dormers at the rear and two rooflights to dwelling house (Use class C3)		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Village		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 11 April 2011		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 6 June 2011	

### RECOMMENDATION

- 1 To grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 To consider the application owing to the number of objections received.

### Site location and description

- 3 The application relates to a property which is a semi-detached house. Most properties along this road are semi-detached although there are detached houses. The detailed design and relationships between buildings vary to the front and rear of properties. Rear dormers extensions were observed at 23 Gilkes Crescent and 17 Gilkes Crescent.
- 4 The property is in the Dulwich Village Conservation Area, but is not a listed building.

### Details of proposal

- 5 The proposal seeks planning permission to erect two rear dormers and two conservation roof lights.

### Amendments

- 6 Amendments received by the council on May 26th which reduced the height, depth and width of the dormer. It was also clarified that the dormer windows would be dressed in lead and that the fascia would be painted white. Amendments were also made to the site plan to more accurately reflect the position of the adjoining property at 23 Gilkes House in response to comments made.

- 7 Both dormers would have a reduced:

Depth: 1.99 metres (previously 2.11 metres)  
Height: 1.45 metres (previously 1.55 metres)  
Width: 1.90, metres (previously 2.88 and 2.44 metres)

## **Planning history**

- 8 No planning history of relevance.

## **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 9 19 GILKES CRESCENT  
No planning history of relevance.
- 10 23 GILKES CRESCENT  
07/AP/1367 Full planning permission was REFUSED to erect a ground and first floor extension in front of existing ground floor side extension and installation of rooflight and bay window extension to rear of existing ground floor extension, all to provide additional residential accommodation for dwellinghouse. 15/08/2007.

The REASONS for REFUSAL were that:

- 1) The proposed first floor portion of the extension by virtue of its location, depth, size and bulk would have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the adjoining semi-detached house and garden at No. 21 Gilkes Crescent, particularly with respect to its light and outlook, that would result in an unneighbourly relationship with the adjoining property; and
- 2) The proposed first floor portion of the extension by virtue of its location, size and bulk would have a detrimental effect on the setting and character of the Dulwich Village Conservation Area, particularly with respect to the result loss of differentiation between the subject site and the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at 21 Gilkes Crescent.
- 11 An appeal was made by the applicant which was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 3/09/2008
- 12 03/AP/1825 Full planning permission was REFUSED to erect a two storey side extension. 14/11/2003.

The REASON for REFUSAL was that the extension by virtue of its depth, size and bulk would have a detrimental effect on the amenity of adjoining semi-detached house and garden at No. 21 Gilkes Crescent, particularly with respect to its light and outlook, that would result in an unneighbourly relationship with the adjoining property. a 0001598 Planning permission GRANTED to erect a single storey extension. 15/02/2001.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 13 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) the impact of the development on the amenity of nearby dwellings
- b) the design of the proposed dormers and whether they would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area

## **Planning policy**

### Saved Southwark Plan Policies 2007 (July)

- 14 3.2 'Protection of amenity'
- 3.12 'Quality in design'
- 3.13 'Urban design'
- 3.16 'Conservation areas'

Dulwich Village Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)

Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2008)

### Core Strategy

- 15 Strategic policy 12 'Design and Conservation'
- Strategic Policy 13 - High Environmental Standards

### **Principle of development**

- 16 There is no objection to the principle of erecting dormers at this location. There would be no conflict with policy.

### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 17 Not required.

### **Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area**

- 18 Policy 3.2 seeks to ensure development would not harm the standard of amenity for occupiers nearby.

#### 19 Visual amenity

Concerns were raised that the dormers would be too wide, have windows out of proportion and that proposed detailing and materials would result in harm to visual amenity.

- 20 A detailed assessment has been provided under the 'design' and 'conservation' section of this report.

#### 21 Daylight and sunlight/Privacy

No issues identified. No objections received.

### **Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development**

- 22 No impacts identified. The site and the surrounding area would remain in residential use.

### **Traffic issues**

- 23 No impacts identified.

### **Design issues**

- 24 Policies 3.12 and 3.13 require development to be of high standard of architectural design and to relate well to surrounding dwellings.
- 25 Concerns were raised that the design, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed roof dormers would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. More specifically that they would be too wide and lack appropriate detailed design. It was also suggested that north most dormer should be pitched and the southern dormer replaced by a conservation roof light similar to one approved at 16 Gilkes Crescent.
- 26 Amendments were received in response to concerns reducing the width and scale of the dormers and amending the materials that would be used for their construction. Both dormers would retain flat roofs but have a much narrower width and proportions, and be clad in lead and have white fascia trims.
- 27 It is accepted the dormer at 16 Gilkes Crescent conforms with design guidance and is of a good standard of design. However that development does not preclude alternative approaches to roof extensions in this area. Guidance in the councils design guidance requires proposals to firstly relate well to the host dwelling and have regard local context to achieve good design.
- 28 There is no objection to the dormer having a flat roof at this location as similar designs were observed at 25, 23, 17 and 15 Gikes Crescent. While flat roofs are no efficient, in terms of rainwater, they are prevalent on this side of Gilkes Crescent and would be considered acceptable in accordance with design guidance as they would appear similar to dormers on either side.
- 29 The amended materials would now comply with adopted design guidance and appropriately respond to the character of the conservation area. Their appearance would be acceptable in design terms and comply with policy.
- 30 There are no objections to the proposed roof lights, which while facing the public highway would be obscured by large trees. Nowwithstanding this, their appearance is unlikely to result in harm to visual amenity.
- 31 There are no objections to the proposed roof lights, which while facing the public highway would be obscured by large trees. Nowwithstanding this, their appearance is unlikely to result in harm to visual amenity.

**Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area**

- 32 Policy 3.16 Conservation areas requires development to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. As noted in the design section of this report the proposal has made an acceptable response with regard to its materials and its immediate context. In this regard the development would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Dulwich Village conservation area.
- 33 Policy HE7.2 of PPS5 requires local planning authorities to take into account the nature of the significance of a heritage asset and the value that it holds for this and future generations. As the site is in Dulwich Village conservation area regard has been given to the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal
- 34 The appraisal document makes no particular reference to the character of dwellings along Gilkes Crescent, which is typically residential and of varied detailed design. The dormers would not be visible from the street and in terms of their general design relate well to the dwelling and its surroundings. For this reason the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and comply with policy HE7.2

of PP5, the Dulwich Village Conservation Area Appraisal and saved policy 3.16.

#### **Impact on trees**

35 No trees would be affected by this proposal.

#### **Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)**

36 Not required.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

37 The development would improve the quality of residential accommodation and result in an addition that would harmonise with the character of the dwelling at its setting within the conservation area. For this reason the proposal would accord with policy and is considered sustainable in accordance with the Core Strategy 2011.

#### **Other matters**

38 Comments were made that drawing 191-12 does not show the garage on the land of 23 Gilkes Crescent correctly nor the driveway in front of No. 21. It is accepted that the relationship of the adjoining site is not shown correctly on the plans but that the plans are considered accurate in terms of the site that would be developed and that the identified inaccuracy has been taken into account, and no considered such that it would prejudice the assessment of the proposal.

#### **Conclusion on planning issues**

39 After careful consideration, the design of the scheme has been amended to overcome concerns and would harmonise much better with the character of the dwelling. It would achieve a high standard of design and comply with policy. It has appropriately responded to the local context where there are a number of much wider flat roof dormers and on balance would preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling. The proposal would comply with the relevant saved policies of the development plan and for this reason is recommended for approval.

#### **Community impact statement**

40 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

41 a) The impact on local people is set out above.

#### **Consultations**

42 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

#### **Consultation replies**

Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

43 Summary of consultation responses

Letters of objection were received from 14 and 19 Gilkes Crescent and the Conservation Area Advisory Group. A letter detailing comments was received from 23

Gilkes Crescent.

### Human rights implications

- 44 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.
- 45 This application has the legitimate aim of providing additional residential accommodation in connection with a residential dwelling house. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

### SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

- 46 None.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2301-21 Application file: 11-AP-1034 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a> Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5461 Council website: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk">www.southwark.gov.uk</a>

### APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received

### AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Daniel Davies, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	7 July 2011	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No.	None received.
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No.	None received.
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No.	None received.
<b>Date final report sent to Community Council Team</b>		15 July 2011

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

**Site notice date:** 05/05/2011

**Press notice date:** 21/04/2011

**Case officer site visit date:** 05/05/2011

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:**

27 April 2011

**Internal services consulted:**

Design and conservation team.

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:**

Conservation Area Advisory Group (CAAG)

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

61 Carlton Avenue

63 Carlton Avenue

59 Carlton Avenue

19 Gilkes Crescent

23 Gilkes Crescent

**Re-consultation:** Not required

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

##### Design and conservation team:

No objection in principle, but recommend a reduction in width and height of dormers to three and two panes wide.

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

##### Conservation Area Advisory Group - Objection to the design of the dormers

##### Comments :

A proposal to enlarge a nice late Arts and Crafts house built circa 1925. The design proposed here is not very sympathetic. The proposed kitchen extension seems too large for the scale of the existing house as does the proposed new dormers to the roof. The designer need to look more carefully at the distinctive proportional character of the Arts and Crafts scene on the handsome Gilkes Crescent. Typically narrower and taller proportions used in contrast to the more spreading proportions shown on this proposal.

#### Neighbours and local groups

Letters of objections were received from:

##### 14 Gilkes Crescent:

The main concerns were that:

- 1) The dormers would be too wide; and
- 2) That the windows would be out of proportion to the space on the roof

##### 19 Gilkes Crescent:

The main concerns were that:

1) the design, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed roof dormers would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. More specifically that it would be too wide, would occupy more than 32% of the rear roof space and that one of the dormers should be replaced by a conservation roof light. In addition to this comments were made that design, detailing and materials of the dormer would be considered unacceptable and out of character with the area and that concrete tiles would compromise the integrity of the host dwelling.

##### Comments were received from:

##### 23 Gilkes Crescent

That drawing 191-12 does not show the garage on the land of 23 Gilkes Crescent correctly nor the driveway in front of No. 21.

That the dwelling appears further forward in relation to the garage extension that it does in reality. That part of the site, as drawn, appears to cut across the front garden at No. 23.