

<b>Item No.</b> 6.3	<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 10-AP-3755 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 60 DULWICH VILLAGE, LONDON, SE21 7AJ  <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of late 20th century additions to allow the construction of a new extension to the side and rear at ground and lower ground floor levels to provide additional living accommodation.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Village		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 This item is before Dulwich Community Council due to the number of letters of objection received.

### Site location and description

- 3 The existing Grade II listed building forms part of a pair of the semi detached houses with no.62. The dwelling is a modest mid-18th century house with an entrance and central stair case and two rooms in the lower ground, ground and first floor and within the original mansard roof.
- 4 Both houses at no 60 and 62 have had extensions over the last 250 years including two storey canted bay to the front elevation (19th century), two storey side extensions (19th century), ground floor side extensions (20th century) and basement rear extensions (20th century). These extensions have, on the whole, retained a sense of the original proportions and relate to the original scale of the architecture and the rooms.
- 5 The application site retains its substantial garden which extends to Boxall Road. The application site lies within the Dulwich Village Conservation Area

### Details of proposal

- 6 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought to demolish the existing single storey rear kitchen extension and the raised 70's extension that sits alongside the front of the building and construction of a full width extension on the ground level of the property and rebuilding and extension of the existing upper ground/first floor extension. The extensions would be a very modern design and would measure as follows;

- 7 Ground floor  
width 11.2m  
length 3.7m from the rear most wall 7.4m deep from undercroft area  
height single storey element 3.1m
- 8 First floor  
width 4.8m  
length 7.9m  
height 4.1m to the front, increasing with the fall of the land at the rear to 5.9m
- 9 A roof terrace is proposed across part of the single storey roof. This has been reduced from the original submission and would be partially planted to provide a terrace area of approximately 14sqm, which would be approximately the same size as the existing terrace, albeit of a different shape.

### **Planning history**

- 10 2/05/1978 Planning permission and listed building consent were granted for the erection of a first floor extension.
- 11 10-AP-0743 Permission granted for the removal and replacement of a Copper Beech tree in the front garden. (21/07/10).
- 12 10-AP-2238 and 10-AP-2239 Planning and listed building consent for the demolition of late 20th century additions and construction of a new extension on lower ground, ground and first floors to the side to provide additional residential accommodation. These applications were withdrawn on 18/08/2010.

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

#### 62 Dulwich Village

- 13 December 1995 planning permission and listed building consent granted for alterations to the existing ground floor extension including a new bay window and 1 metre high balustrade to roof garden.
- 14 May 2006 Listed building consent granted for the opening up of a chimney breast in lower ground floor kitchen.
- 15 29/10/2009 Planning and listed building consent granted for alterations and replacing windows.

#### 54 Dulwich Village

- 16 9701104 Erection of a single storey ground floor kitchen /dining extension to the rear of the property and ground floor infill extension.
- 17 98000590 Single storey ground floor kitchen / dining extension and single storey hall and infill extension.

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **Summary of main issues**

- 18 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
  - a) the impact of the proposal upon the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours

b) the impact of the proposed extension upon the existing listed building and wider setting of the Dulwich Village Conservation Area

### **Planning policy**

#### Core Strategy 2011

- 19 Strategic Policy 12 Design and conservation  
Strategic Policy 13 High environmental standards

#### Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 20 3.2 Protection of amenity  
3.12 Quality of design  
3.13 Urban design  
3.15 Conservation of the historic environment  
3.16 Conservation areas  
3.17 Listed buildings
- 21 Dulwich Village Conservation Area Appraisal

#### Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

- 22 PPS5 Planning and the historic environment

### **Principle of development**

- 23 There are no land use objections to extending residential dwellings.

### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 24 Not required for an application of this type. No significant environmental impacts would arise.

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

- 25 The main impacts are to the properties sharing a boundary with the application site.
- 26 62 Dulwich Village  
This house forms part of a pair with no. 60, although both houses sit on different shaped plots. No. 62 has a similar upper ground/first floor extension with an open undercroft area underneath. This extension is wider than the existing extension at no. 60 and its appearance to the front is as a brick facade, but to the rear it contains large expanses of glazing. This dwelling also benefits from a single storey extension at ground level with a roof terrace above.
- 27 The proposed single storey element of the rear extension at lower ground floor level would be set 1.5m back from the rear of the existing extension at no. 62. The ground floor extension has a large footprint but would not result in any loss of amenity through light, privacy or outlook to this dwelling.
- 28 Concern has been raised about noise from the terrace. The proposed new roof terrace has been reduced from the original submission to address some of the concerns raised by neighbours about loss of privacy and overlooking. Whilst the terrace would be wider, (following the full width of the single storey element), it would

fairly shallow extending to a depth of 2 metres with a width of 6.8m. It is considered that given its limited size it is unlikely to give rise to unneighbourly levels of noise nuisance. The proposal would maintain the existing party wall between the existing terrace at no. 62 and the proposed terrace for no. 60. This wall is heavily vegetated with ivy and provides adequate screening between the two areas.

29 The upper part of the extension would be set some distance from the boundary with no. 62, and it would be visible to the occupants of no. 62 from their garden and from the upper level windows of their property. Given the distance it is not envisaged that this element of the proposal would result in a loss of light, outlook or overshadowing. Concern has been raised about the potential for light pollution from the glazed areas to the side and rear. Whilst there are expanses of glass, it is not considered that the light from a domestic dwelling would result in a level of harm to the neighbour to such that would warrant refusal of the application.

30 64 Dulwich Village

This house lies within what would have been part of the gardens of no. 62 Dulwich Village. The house was designed to have its main outlook onto Boxall Road and to the rear of nos 70 -78 (even ) Dulwich Village, as such there is only one window looking onto the garden of no. 60, with no direct overlooking to the rear of the house. It is therefore not considered that there would be any physical impacts to this dwelling such that would give rise to any significant amenity concerns.

31 54 Dulwich Village

This house lies on the northern boundary of the application site and is a modern property, which has been extended to both the front and rear. The lower level extension due to its location would not be seen from this property as it is set well back from the rear of the ground floor to this dwelling and separated by the high boundary walls.

32 The roof terrace would not result in any increase in views when compared with the existing roof terrace, due to its set back from the edge of the ground floor and location behind the upper ground floor/first floor extension.

33 The upper part of the extension would be constructed in brick on the flank elevation with glazing to the rear. The extension would be further forward (approx. 3m) when compared with the upper parts of no. 54, but would not be as high as the first floor level of this property, (approx. 1.5m lower) and would be located 2.6 metres off the boundary. In terms of physical impacts of loss of light and overshadowing there would be no detrimental harm such that would justify refusing the scheme. The rear elevation of the upper floor part of the extension would consist of full height glazing, which could be seen as giving rise to a loss of privacy, however at this level the window serves a staircase, limiting opportunities for overlooking.

34 Concern has been raised about the potential for light pollution from the glazed areas to the side and rear. Whilst these areas do include expanses of glass, it is not considered that the light from a domestic dwelling would result in a level of harm to this property such that would warrant refusal of the application.

Boxall Road

35 Whilst not directly adjoining the site some of the houses to the north west of this road do have views through to the rear of no. 60 Dulwich Village. These houses are some 50+ metres away from the rear of the house, and whilst there may be views from the upper parts of the houses on this road it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity for residents within these properties.

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

- 36 The proposed residential use is unchanged and is unlikely to affect the residential uses within the immediate vicinity.

### **Traffic issues**

- 37 There are no traffic issues raised as a consequence of the proposal.

### **Design issues**

- 38 There are no design, listed building or conservation area issues with the demolition of the existing non original extensions.

Where the extension of a listed building is being considered, particular consideration is given to the scale and height of the proposal and national guidelines suggest that extensions and alterations should remain subservient and complementary to the heritage asset. In this case, the existing listed building extends to four floors including the lower ground floor and the mansard roof accommodation. Further, the substantial size of the site suggests that it can accommodate a sensitively designed extension.

- 39 The proposed development is arranged in two parts. The first is an extension to the lower ground floor that wraps itself around the north and east flanks of the existing building and is largely invisible when viewed from the street, due to the slope across the site. This part of the scheme has been designed to echo the dimensions and proportions of the existing reception room of the listed building and includes the removal of an unsympathetic later addition on the boundary with No 62. Here the proposal has been designed as a lightweight glazed construction which will open up views through to the back wall existing listed building. In this scheme glass has been used as a device to separate the old from the new and where the roof of the new extension meets the existing building, glass is used to connect the two and will allow light to wash across the existing historic building. The quality of the design will rely entirely on the choice of glass and this should be conditioned to ensure that it is not excessively reflective and allows clear and unencumbered views of the listed building. Glass technology is such that a non-reflective clear glass can and should be possible to use on this part of the design.
- 40 The second part of the scheme is upper ground floor side extension that forms a new sitting room in the area of the existing extension and extends approximately 2m further into the garden but not to the rear edge of the lower ground floor extension below. This set-back at the upper floor of the extension is significant because it separates the upper part of the scheme from the lower ground floor and reduces its dominance. This part of the scheme continues the theme of glass connecting the old to the new but takes on a more appropriate brick-faced construction on the more prominent north and east faces that are visible from the street. Here the scheme continues the theme of the pair of listed buildings with a confident but elegant extension at upper ground level that enhances the listed building through its marked contrast and takes on a design that has the qualities of a brick-built garden wall. The detailed design of this wall and its relationship to the listed building will be crucial to the quality of the design and should therefore be conditioned to ensure that the brick reveals at the windows are suitably deep, the angled faces of the brickwork are crisply executed, and the glass connections to the existing building are designed to preserve the architectural features of the original building.
- 41 The most significant change between the existing building and the proposed scheme is the inclusion of a high roof terrace over the lower ground floor extension that

creates an external link between the sitting room to the music room. This is not a new feature to this listed building or indeed the pair of listed buildings. The existing building already has a terrace over the existing kitchen immediately adjacent to that at No 62. The proportions of the proposed lower ground floor extension result in an extension that is set-back 0.5m from the existing adjacent roof terrace. Further, the feature glass return on the roof means that the edge of the terrace is set back a further 750mm from the rear face of the proposed extension, in a further reduction of terrace there is the inclusion of a sedum roof 1 metre in depth. Therefore, the arrangement is such that the new terrace is set-back at least 2m from the rear face of the existing terrace.

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

- 42 Saved policy 3.16 states that within conservation areas, development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. New development, including alterations and extensions should:
- i. Respect the context of the conservation area, having regard to the content of Conservation Area Appraisals and other adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents; and
  - ii. Use high quality materials that complement and enhance the conservation area; and
  - iii. Do not involve the loss of existing traditional features of interest which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; and
  - iv. Do not introduce design details or features that are out of character with the area, such as the use of windows and doors made of aluminium, uPVC or other non-traditional materials.
- 43 The proposed scheme is set to the rear of the property and preserves the existing appearance of the conservation area from the street. It replaces an unsympathetic side extension with a new extension that does not exceed the scale and height of the original when viewed from the public highway.
- 44 The proposal employs traditional materials on the most visible north and east faces and more modern materials to the rear where large areas of glass and metal are used at the lower ground floor. Whilst these are not traditional materials, they are used to enhance the connection between the existing building and its substantial garden and preserve and enhance views of the rear of the property where it can be viewed in its private setting.
- 45 The proposed extension, divided as it is into two parts, is appropriate both in scale and materials in the most prominent approaches and views and will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Dulwich Village Conservation Area due its appropriate use of materials and features in this sensitive historic context.
- 46 Saved policy 3.17 states that development proposals involving a listed building should preserve the building and its features of special architectural or historic interest. Further that planning permission for proposals which involve an alteration or extension to a listed building will only be permitted where:
- i. There is no loss of important historic fabric; and
  - ii. The development is not detrimental to the special architectural or historic interest of the building; and
  - iii. The development relates sensitively and respects the period, style, detailing and context of the listed building or later alterations of architectural or historic interest; and
  - iv. Existing detailing and important later additional features of the building are preserved, repaired or, if missing, replaced.

- 47 The proposal meets all these requirements. The extension interfaces with the original listed building in a delicate and appropriate manner and preserves all its features of historic and architectural significance. The extension echoes the plan form of the original building in its proportions and its geometry and in that way it complements this nationally important building. The rooms that are affected internally retain their original integrity and this extension offers the optimal use to this building.
- 48 The aesthetic of this proposal complements this listed building in an appropriate manner. Glass is used sensitively to the rear of the property, preserving the significance of the original Georgian property by deliberately separating the new from the old. The glazed facade offers clear views through to the original building and connects to the original building, enhancing its appearance by allowing the sunlight to bathe its principle features. In this way the contrast of styles and materials is not harmful but enhances the historical significance of the original building.
- 49 The proposal involves the modest internal re-organisation of this listed property. This is mainly on the lower ground floor where new partitions will be used to create a new toilet beneath the main entrance and to divide the rear-facing room to create a separate TV room and utility room. Whilst such a division of a single room would not normally be considered appropriate, it appears to reinstate the plan form of the original dwelling and echoes the original arrangement of spaces at the lower ground floor. In this respect the proposal does not involve the loss of historic features of the heritage asset but will alter its setting in a nominal and fitting manner. Such a modest change can only be described as less than substantial harm to the heritage asset as set out in PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment
- 50 Policy HE 9.4 of PPS5 states that : *“Where a proposal has a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset which is less than substantial harm, in all cases local planning authorities should:*
- (i) weigh the public benefit of the proposal (for example, that it helps to secure the optimum viable use of the heritage asset in the interests of its long-term conservation) against the harm; and*
- (ii) recognise that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset the greater the justification will be needed for any loss.”*
- 51 This proposal will result in a marked improvement of this fine Georgian property. It complements the historic building and its pair appropriately. It does not involve the loss of any features of significance. It is considered that the scheme enhances to appreciation of this heritage asset. In this way it improves the use and enjoyment of this property that should not only give this building a longer lease on life but embed a more appropriate use in the internal arrangement.

The Core Strategy, at Strategic Policy 12, also seeks the conservation and protection of historic and natural places. Development is expected to preserve or enhance the historic environment. It is considered that this proposal is compliant with this policy.

### **Impact on trees**

- 52 The proposed application would result in the loss of Fir tree, close to the front of the property. A Copper Beach was felled last year and has yet to be replaced. It is acknowledged that the fir tree is not in good health as its growth has been suppressed by other trees on the site. A condition is therefore recommended that at least two trees are planted in the front of the property and a further condition is recommended to ensure that nearby trees are protected during the course of construction.

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

- 53 The scheme is not of a size or type that would require mitigation by way of financial contributions.

### **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 54 Planning and listed building consent are sought for the extension of the existing Georgian house. The extensions, due to their size and design, have attracted considerable opinion from residents in Dulwich, both in opposition and support. It is acknowledged that the proposed extensions are fairly large, but it is not considered that they would be harmful in terms of overlooking, privacy, loss of light or overshadowing. The issue is then around the design, materials and impacts of the extension to the listed building and to the Dulwich Village Conservation Area. This has been duly considered by officers and it is considered that extending the property in the form presented would be both sensitive and respectful, and would not compromise the character or setting of the listed building or conservation area.
- 55 It is acknowledged that there are varying opinions on this matter, but taking account of all of the views expressed, officers are minded to recommend approval to the granting of both planning and listed building consent.

### **Community impact statement**

- 56 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.

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

b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as above.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above. Specific actions to ameliorate these implications are included within the suggested conditions attached to the permission.

### **Consultations**

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

### **Consultation replies**

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

### **59 Summary of consultation responses**

- Height, bulk and loss of plan form would cause demonstrable harm to the listed building.
- Design, scale, bulk and massing would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.



- Significant loss of amenity to adjoining properties.
- Loss of trees
- Loss of view and open sky aspect
- Extensions would not be subservient to the main building
- Impact of light pollution from first floor extension onto no. 54 Dulwich Village
- Impact from use of roof terrace.

60 A number of letters have also been received in support of the proposed extension.

### **Human rights implications**

61 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.

62 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a residential extension. 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**

63 None.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2292-60  Application file: 10-AP-3755  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 5434 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>	Sonia Watson, Senior Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	23 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	n/a	
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	n/a	
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	n/a	
<b>Date final report sent to the Community Council Team</b>	26 August 2011	

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

**Site notice date:** 14/01/2011

**Press notice date:** 13/01/2011

**Case officer site visit dates:**

3 March 2011 -60 Dulwich Village

8 March 2011- 62 Dulwich Village

12 May 2011 - 54 Dulwich Village

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 17/01/2011

**Internal services consulted:**

Urban Forester  
Conservation and Design

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

N/A

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

76 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
74 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
59 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7BJ  
57 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7BJ  
62 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
54 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
72 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
64 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
61 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7BJ  
70 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
78 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 266 TURNEY ROAD LONDON SE21 7JP  
82 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
65 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7BJ  
63 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7BJ  
80 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
67 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7BJ  
17 BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
15 BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
25 BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
23 BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
GROUND FLOOR 80 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
FIRST FLOOR 78 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
268 TURNEY ROAD LONDON SE21 7JP  
27 BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
50 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ

21C-21D BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
54 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
52 DULWICH VILLAGE LONDON SE21 7AJ  
17A BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
15A BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
21B BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
21A BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
13A BOXALL ROAD LONDON SE21 7JS  
25 Kingsthorpe Road London SE26 4PG  
64 Dulwich Village London SE21 7AJ  
97 Burbage Road London SE24 9HD  
Via Email XXXX  
Via Email XXXXX  
50 Ashbourne Grove London SE22 8RL  
118 Dulwich Village XXX  
50 Beckwith Road London SE24 9LG  
32 Gilkes Crescent Dulwich London SE21 7BS  
127 Burbage Road Dulwich London SE21 7AF  
40 Dulwich Village London SE21 7AL  
79 Alleyn Road Dulwich London SE21 8AD  
85 Holmdene Avenue London SE24 9LD  
77 Barry Road East Dulwich London SE22 OHR  
63 Wiverton Road Sydenham London SE26 5JB  
14 Court Lane Dulwich London SE21 7DR  
194 Lordship Lane Dulwich London SE22 8LE  
194 Lordship Lane Dulwich London SE22 8LE  
188 Upland Road Dulwich London SE22 ODH  
74 Dovercourt Road Dulwich London SE22 8UW  
55 Beauval Road Dulwich SE22 8UG  
36 Alleyn Road Dulwich London SE21 8AL  
127 Burbage Road Dulwich London SE21  
127 Burbage Road Dulwich London SE21  
115 Dulwich Village London SE21 7BJ  
Gate House 1 St John's Square London EC1M 4DH

Dulwich Society

**Re-consultation:**

21/04/2011

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

Conservation and design - Detailed comments contained within the officer report paras 38-51

Urban forester - no objections subject to conditions.

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

n/a

#### Neighbours and local groups

62 Dulwich Village - Objects. Loss of existing first floor extension which works as a pair with no. 62, filling in the space under the extension would not improve the views of passers by or sit well with the pair. The scale of the extension to the rear drowns out the Georgian character of the property. The roof terrace at first floor would be too close to living and bedroom windows and use of this space for parties or outdoor events will increase overlooking and erode privacy as well as create a noise nuisance. The proposal more than doubles the use of glass leading to light pollution, the type of glass is not specified but it will provide views from the street into a room rather than an open space. There would be a loss of balance between the two houses with the loss of the suspended first floor extension which were designed by the same architect. There is an objection to the removal of the brick wall that divides the terraces of the two properties and the removal of the tree to the front of the property. The proposal may result in structural damage. The provision of a music room on the shared boundary should only be permitted if sound insulation is provided on the shared party wall.

Revisions do not address issues of concern. The drawings are misleading and reference to lower ground and upper ground floor levels is inaccurate. The proposed extension will block light to no. 54. The terrace area is still too large and the proposal will overwhelm the original building. The loss of outlook, and privacy to neighbours is unacceptable. The development is not in accordance with Council policy and should be refused.

64 Dulwich Village - Objects. The house stands as a pair and the alterations proposed will destroy the similarity from the Village aspect. The expanse of glass to the rear at first floor would impact upon the amenity to our house and those on Boxall Road.

Although in glass the extension at 62 is not visible from Boxall Road or out property, the open nature of the application site will make more visible like a supermarket.

54 Dulwich Village - Objects to the extension on the grounds of its size, materials used, removal of a tree and impact upon amenity. The existing extension works in conjunction with the adjoining pair, infilling the space under the extension would disrupt the balance of the two houses, the roof terrace will be intrusive to the garden and living areas, the amount of glass used would cause light pollution. The proposed extension would result in the destruction of a large part of the listed building.

52 Dulwich Village - Objects overall plan and footprint is too large, almost doubling the footprint and is not in the spirit of what is an extension. Concern is raised around light spillage from the glass element to the rear.

The revisions go some way to overcoming concerns but do not alter the scale of extension to the house, which will dominate the area and the light spillage will still be an issue.

50 Dulwich Village - Objects. The symmetry between the pair of houses would be lost at the rear, the light spillage from the glass extension at the rear would be detrimental to the adjoining dwellings. There should be no more loss of trees.

SE21 7AG - Objects plans would demolish part of a listed building and replace it with a structure likely to impinge on the privacy, light and cause glare to surrounding neighbours. The proposal would also result in the loss of a tree

115 Dulwich Village - Objects to proposal due to impact on neighbours and loss of a tree.

15a Boxall Road - Objects to use of glass on Georgian building, view of extension from front bedroom and potential for light pollution.

50 Beckwith Road - Objects the proposal is insensitive to the building and is out of character with the area and the host house.

North House Dulwich Village - Objects, marginally better than first submission, but still too large and use of glass unneighbourly. Proposal is not suitable for the conservation area.

Written objection from Greer Pritchard on behalf of no. 62 Dulwich Village

#### Impact on the listed building

Consideration should be given to the dwelling as a pair which is how they appear in the Statutory List. The proposal will substantially increase the mass and bulk of the property and form an unsympathetic addition to the listed building. The loss of the Elsom modern extension cannot be justified with the replacement of something entirely unsuitable. The pair currently have views through and over the existing modern extensions to the side the proposed lower ground extension would increase the footprint and these views will be lost detrimental to the host building and to the adjoining house at no. 62.

#### Impact on the conservation area

The existing 20th century extensions have a light touch and this would be lost by the scale, massing and inappropriate materials proposed by the new additions. Any increase in plot size would cause demonstrable harm to the conservation area and listed buildings. At night light emitted from the glazed areas at the rear would be out of place with the conservation area. There is no way of controlling the level of light emission, which will impact on neighbours.

#### Impact on amenity

The roof terrace will seriously compromise the amenity of the adjoining neighbours and the full width ground and increased first floor extension will be detrimental to the amenity of nos. 54 and 62 Dulwich Village.

#### Conditions

It is suggested that conditions are imposed to control the hours of construction works and to ensure servicing takes place from Boxall Road. It is also suggested that a

structural report is provided detailing how the facade of the building will be supported during construction as well as details of foundations for the proposed additions and works for the existing foundations.

### Support

97 Burbage Road - Supports the application , feels the scaled down extension will be a vast improvement.

50 Ashbourne Grove - Writes in support of the application, alterations should significantly improve the look of the property.

118 Dulwich Village Writes in support of the application, which returns the building to its former glory as well as giving it an attractive modern addition.

55 Beauval Road - Writes in support of the application, the proposal is architecturally more suitable for a conservation area.

36 Alleyn Road - Writes in support of the application as the existing extensions are neither attractive or appropriate to the grandeur of the house.

127 Burbage Road - Writes in support of the application, the proposal will improve the architectural heritage of the area. The contemporary design is of high quality referencing other key local buildings such as the Picture Gallery. The extension has been designed to maintain the integrity of the original building. The extension is well set back from the historic property allowing it to maintain its prominence. It utilises the space well and allows the neighbours to maintain their privacy by enclosing the terrace area.

74 Dovercourt Road - Writes in support of the application High quality innovative design, which will benefit the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.

188 Upland Road - Writes in support of the application. Clear that thought has gone into the design and the development is in keeping with the conservation area.

194 Lordship Lane -Writes in support of the application. Extension will be more aesthetically pleasing than the existing structures.

14 Court Lane - Writes in support of the application. Believes the proposal will enhance the conservation area.

63 Wiverton Road - Writes in support of the application. Proposal will improve the streetscape.

77 Barry Road - Writes in support of the application.

85 Holmdene Ave - Writes in support of the application. The proposal will preserve and enhance the character of the conservation area.

79 Alleyn Road - Writes in support of the application. Proposal will improve the streetscape and improve the amenity for the residents.

40 Dulwich Village - Writes in support of the application. Feels the extension will improve the accommodation and that other extensions within the area have been allowed change should be embraced.

Dulwich Society Objects size of the rear terrace and the potential impact for the amenity of the adjoining dwellings. the bulk of the side and rear extensions would be disproportionate to the existing dwelling. The large expanse of glass to the rear and the impacts in terms of light emission, privacy and use of reflective materials. The extensive footprint which fails to give a subordinate balance between the proposed extensions and the original building. The size of the garden should not be an overriding consideration in the assessment of the application.