

<b>Item No.</b> 6.1	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 8 September 2011	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Dulwich Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-1040 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 21 GILKES CRESCENT, LONDON, SE21 7BP  <b>Proposal:</b> Proposed ground floor front and rear extensions (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 ground floor extensions were observed at 23 and 19 Gilkes Crescent.
- 4 The property is in the Dulwich Village Conservation Area, but is not a listed building.

### Details of proposal

- 5 Planning permission is sought to erect a single storey rear extension.
- 6 Dimensions:
- 7 Width: 5.75  
Depth: 4.2  
Eaves Height: 2.5  
Maximum Pitch: 4.05
- 8 Materials: Clay tiled roof, timber windows, timber glazed double doors, white render, black fascia and guttering.
- 9

### Amendments

Amended plans were received showing the removal of a raised platform. They also

indicate the distance of the proposed extension with one similar at 19 Gilkes Crescent (191-07 rev B). A revised site plan was also received responding to comments by occupiers at 23 Gilkes Crescent.

### **Planning history**

- 10 11-AP-1034 Full planning permission REFUSED to erect two dormers at the rear and two rooflights to the dwelling house on 28/07/2011.
- 11 The REASON for REFUSAL was that:
- 12 *"The plans as submitted do not accurately reflect the existing roof structure of the property. As such, the proposed dormer window on the lower section of roof would be overly dominant and would fail to harmonise with the original dwelling, to the detriment of both the visual amenity of surrounding neighbours and to the character of the Dulwich Village Conservation Area. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved policies 3.2 Protection of amenity, 3.12 Quality in design, 3.15 Conservation of the historic environment and 3.16 Conservation areas of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 12 Design and conservation of the Core Strategy 2011 and the Residential Design Standards SPD 2008 and the Dulwich Village Conservation Area Appraisal 2006"*

### **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 13 19 GILKES CRESCENT  
No planning history of relevance.
- 14 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.
- 15 The REASONS for REFUSAL were that:
- 16 *"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 would be contrary to policy 3.2 Protection of amenity of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan and guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 5 'Standards Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development; and*
- 17 *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, and would be contrary to Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity, 3.12 Quality in design, 3.16 Development in conservation areas and 3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation areas of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan".*
- 18 An appeal was made by the applicant which was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 3/09/2008

- 19 03/AP/1825 Full planning permission was REFUSED to erect a two storey side extension. 14/11/2003.
- 20 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 and would be contrary to Policy E.3.1 'Protection of amenity of the adopted Unitary Development Plan, Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity of the Draft Southwark plan and guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 'Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development'.*

0001598

- 21 Planning permission GRANTED to erect a single storey extension. 15/02/2001.

59 CARLTON AVENUE

- 22 No planning history of relevance.

61 CARLTON AVENUE

- 23 No planning history of relevance.

63 CARLTON AVENUE

- 24 No planning history of relevance.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 25 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) the impact of the development on the amenity of nearby occupiers
  - b) the acceptability of the extensions design and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area

### **Planning policy**

#### Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

- 26 Saved policy 3.2 'Protection of amenity'  
Saved policy 3.12 'Quality in design'  
Saved policy 3.13 'Urban design'  
Saved policy 3.16 'Conservation areas'
- 27 Dulwich Village Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)  
Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2008)  
Draft Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (April 2011)

#### Core Strategy

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

### **Principle of development**

- 28 There is no objection to the principle of erecting a rear extension to this residential property.

## **Environmental impact assessment**

29 Not required.

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

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

#### 31 Daylight and sunlight

Occupiers at 19 Gilkes Crescent were concerned that the development would result in the loss of light to their property. These concerns were supported by occupiers at No. 14.

32 By virtue of the distance of separation between the development and windows at No. 19, the scheme would meet the council's design standards and those of the British Research Establishment (BRE) with regard to daylight and sunlight. Although the development may create some slight overshadowing in the late afternoon, that impact would be acceptable and in accordance with adopted and recognised professional standards. There is therefore no objection in terms of the schemes impact on daylight and sunlight as there would be no reasonable basis on which to warrant the refusal of planning permission in this regard.

33 No impacts are anticipated to occupiers at No 23 as the development would be built along the boundary wall where there is a large existing garage.

#### 34 Visual amenity

Visual amenity is covered in detail under the 'design' section of this report.

#### 35 Privacy

Neighbours at 14 and 19 were concerned that a rear platform would create potential privacy issues. The applicant has overcome this concern by removing reference to a platform in revised plans. Notwithstanding this, the extension is single storey and not anticipated to create privacy issues for occupiers on any of its adjoining boundaries.

36 Based on this analysis the development would not create amenity problems and complies with saved policy 3.2.

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

37 None identified.

#### **Traffic issues**

38 None identified.

#### **Design issues**

39 Saved policies 3.12 and 3.13 require development to have a high standard of architectural design and to relate well to nearby buildings and dwellings.

40 Concerns were raised that the scale of the extension was too large compared to the existing house and that the development lacked detailed decorative detailing like that on similar extensions in the area.

- 41 The scheme would match the scale of an extension at 19 Gilkes Crescent and balance this pair of semi-detached houses at rear ground floor level. Detailed decorative features were not observed on nearby extensions although it is accepted they have the potential to add character. The materials proposed would match the host dwelling, appear subservient and would not create adverse amenity impacts. For these reasons the scheme would comply with adopted residential design guidance and saved policies of the Southwark Plan and of a standard that would be acceptable.

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

- 42 Policy 3.16 Conservation areas requires development to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal has made an acceptable response with regard to its scale, fenestration and materials in its immediate context. In this regard the development would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Dulwich Village conservation area.
- 43 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
- 44 The appraisal document makes no particular reference to the character of dwellings along Gilkes Crescent, or the character of extensions to the rear. The addition would not be visible from the street and in terms of its general design would 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**

- 45 None. No trees would be affected.

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

- 46 Not required for this development.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

- 47 None arising.

#### **Other matters**

- 48 None.

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

- 49 The scheme would comply with relevant policies in the development plan. For this reason it is recommended that the application be approved.

#### **Community impact statement**

- 50 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.

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

### **Consultations**

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.

#### Summary of consultation responses

- 52 3 letters of objection received. Main concerns were the impact of the scheme on daylight, sunlight and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### **Human rights implications**

- 53 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.
- 54 This application has the legitimate aim of providing additional residential accommodation. 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**

- 55 None.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2301-21 Application file: 11-AP-1040 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>	19 August 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	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Community Council Team</b>	26 August 2011	

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

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

**Press notice date:** 14/07/2011

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

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 30/04/2011

**Internal services consulted:**

None.

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

Conservation Area Advisory Group.

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:** None.

**Re-consultation:** Not required.



### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

None received.

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

##### Conservation Area Advisory Group

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. There is a lovely range of subtle decorative details in this and the surrounding houses, on this street, typically in brick and clay tile. The applicant might consider adding subtle, well-observed detailing to the exposed extension instead of the typically lazy 'white render' external finish.

#### Neighbours and local groups

##### 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:

- 2) The development would result in a significant loss of amenity to adjacent properties by way of the raised platform to the rear, in particular by way of overlooking.

##### Comments were received from:

##### 23 Gilkes Crescent

That drawing 131-12 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.