

Item No. 6.1	Classification: Open	Date: 17 October 2011	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 10-AP-3752 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 6 BEAUVAL ROAD, LONDON, SE22 8UQ Proposal: Dormer roof extensions to main rear roofslope and over outrigger, providing additional residential accommodation for dwellinghouse.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Village		
From:	Head of Development Management		

1 **RECOMMENDATION**

2 Grant planning permission.

4 **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

4 This item was deferred from the Dulwich Community Council meeting on 28 July 2011 in order for a site visit to be undertaken. A site visit took place on 1 September 2011, with Councillors Lewis Robinson, Michael Mitchell and Toby Eckersley. In addition the applicant has provided a daylight / shadow study to demonstrate potential impacts upon no. 4 Beauval Road.

5 Comments have been received on behalf of the objector at no. 4 Beauval Road on the information submitted, which are as follows;

6 *“The study that the applicant has submitted is wholly inadequate. It does not distinguish between daylight and sunlight and it only looks at one point in the year – the 21 of June. Daylight and sunlight studies should be done on the 21st of March through to the 21 of September and not the 21 June. The shadow study does not assess the impact on individual rooms. We need to see a study that assess daylight and sunlight and gives the vertical sky components for each window, with or without the new development in place.*

The BRE Report recommends that for existing buildings sunlight should be checked for all main living rooms of dwellings if they have a window facing 90 degrees of due south. The BRE report states that if the centre of the window can receive more than one quarter of annual probable sunlight hours, including at least 5% of annual probable sunlight hours in the winter months between 21 September and 21 March, then the room should still receive enough sunlight. The shadow study submitted does not give us or Council Officers this information and therefore one cannot assess it independently”.

7 Details of the application are set out in officer report below.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2313-6 Application file: 10-AP-3752 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: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5458 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Report 28 July 2011

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Sonia Watson, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	29 September 2011	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	5 October 2011	

Item No.	Classification: OPEN	Date: 28 July 2011	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 10-AP-3752 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 6 BEAUVAL ROAD, LONDON, SE22 8UQ Proposal: Dormer roof extensions to main rear roofslope and over outrigger, providing additional residential accommodation for dwellinghouse.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Village		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 23 December 2010		Application Expiry Date 17 February 2011	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 This application is being referred to Dulwich Community Council for consideration due to the number of objections received. The application site is a 2 storey terrace dwellinghouse located on the western side of Beauval Road. The properties on this road are all of similar style and size with a number of properties having some form of extension. It should be noted that no. 4 Beauval Road sits on a slightly lower ground level to the application site
- 3 The application site is not listed, but located within the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.

Details of proposal

- 4 Planning permission is sought for a rear and side roof extension to the main rear roofslope and over the outrigger, providing additional residential accommodation for dwellinghouse.
- 5 The extension to the main rear slope would measure 5.190 metres wide, 2.5 metres high and 2.5 metres in depth and would consist of a timber framed sash window. The extension on the outrigger would measure 4 metres wide, 2.4 metres high on the horizontal face and 1.7 metres high on the vertical face and 3 metres in depth and would consist of a timber framed sash window with opaque glazing. The materials to be used for this development would match the of the existing building and will include 3 conservation rooflights to the front of the property.
- 6 The scheme has been revised since it was first submitted, reducing the overall bulk of the extension proposed.

Planning history

- 7 None

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 8 4 Beauval Road
Planning permission (01-AP-1787) was refer granted in September 2002 for the conversion of loft space together with the construction of a rear dormer window to provide additional living accommodation.
- 9 2 Beauval Road
Planning permission (06/AP/2402) was refused May 2007for a rear mansard roof extension to the main roof slope and outrigger.

Planning permission (07/AP/2633) was granted in January 2008 for the erection of a side extension and 2 dormer extensions on the rear elevation and the outrigger.
- 10 8 Beauval Road
Planning permission (08/AP/2061) was granted in October 2008 for dormer extensions to rear and side roof planes as well as 2 rooflights to the front elevation and two rooflights to the side elevation; to provide additional residential accommodation for dwellinghouse.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 11 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) The principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.
 - b) Design of the proposed extension
 - c) Impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.

Planning policy

- 12 Saved Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

3.2 Protection of amenity
3.12 Quality in design
3.13 Urban design
3.15 Conservation of the historic environment
3.16 Conservation areas
3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings, conservation areas and word heritage sites
- 13 Residential Design Standards SPD (2008)
Dulwich Village conservation area appraisal.
- 14 London Plan 2008 consolidated with alterations since 2004
N/A

Core Strategy

- 15 Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High Environmental Standards

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

- 16 PPS 5: Planning for the historic environment

Principle of development

- 17 There are no objections in principle to extending residential dwellings, subject to their impacts upon neighbouring residential properties, the host dwelling and the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.

Environmental impact assessment

- 18 None

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

- 19 The development would not impact upon no. 8 Beauval Road to any significant degree and any impact resulting from the development would be to the occupiers at 4 Beauval Road.
- 20 The extension over the outrigger would be at a height that could create some potential for overlooking towards the adjoining property at number 4. It is suggested that a condition be added to the proposal requiring this window to be obscured and top hung opening only so that the potential for any overlooking is minimised. It is not considered that the roof lights proposed to the other side of the outrigger extension diminish the level of privacy to the adjoining property.
- 21 In terms of daylight and sunlight the proposed roof extension would not exceed the height of the existing roof slopes, so whilst there may be some impact due to the additional bulk, it is considered that the side outrigger extension would not cause any harmful loss of daylight or sunlight to the adjoining property at no. 4. The lightwell areas are quite narrow and most of the sunlight is gained from the west and this situation would not change as a consequence of the proposal.

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

- 22 The proposed development is residential, a use which conforms to the residential nature of the area. It is not anticipated that any nearby or adjoining uses will have an adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of the proposed development.

Traffic issues

- 23 There are no traffic issues arising as a result of this application.

Design issues

- 24 The proposal raises no fundamental issues with regards to its appearance. The proposed extension would use materials to match the existing building. In addition, the proposed development would mirror the roof extensions at no. 8 Beauval Road

which was granted planning permission in 2008.

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

25 There are no listed buildings close to the application site, however, the site is in the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.

26 The impact of this proposal on the heritage asset - the Dulwich Village conservation area and its setting - is considered against the requirements of PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment. 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."

27 This proposal will have a nominal impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. There is no loss of historic fabric and no impact on the viewer's appreciation of the rear of the properties in the conservation area or its setting.

Impact on trees

28 No trees would be affected by the works

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

29 Not required

Sustainable development implications

30 N/A

Other matters

31 No other matters were identified.

Conclusion on planning issues

32 It is not considered there is any adverse impact on the character of the dwelling nor on the character of the Conservation Area resulting from the proposed development on the rear property. The size of the proposal is adequate for this property and would be located at the rear of the building and not visible from the public domain. Further subject to conditions, it is not considered that the proposal would be so harmful such that would diminish the amenity currently enjoyed by the adjoining properties. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.

Community impact statement

33 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.

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

- 35 b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified.
- 36 c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 39 6 Dovercourt Road
The development isn't in keeping with the surrounding architecture. Suggest looking at the other loft conversion in the neighbouring houses such as no 2, no.4 and no.8, which have been built sympathetically to the style of architecture, also with the same window design which are different from the proposed plans. This objection was subsequently withdrawn.
- 40 4 Beauval Road
Objects on the grounds that the proposed extension in the loft would cause significant harm to our residential amenities by reason of its siting, scale and design, and that the design is not in keeping with the objective of the Dulwich Conservation Area to positively preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area
- 41 3 Dovercourt Road
Raises concerns about a design matching the adjoining property at no. 8 but not taking account of its own context with the adjoining neighbour at no. 4 which sits at a lower level thus resulting in overlooking as a result of the dormer extending across the outrigger.
- 42 It looks out of character with other loft conversions on the road.
- 43 The council received Written Representation from Greer Pritchard (planning & urban design) via email on the 14th February made on behalf of Isabel & Don Marshal in relation to planning application 10/AP/3752 at 6 Beauval Road, Dulwich, London SE22.
- 44 This report represents the interests and objection of immediate neighbours who live at 4 Beauval Road. They have engaged Greer Pritchard to represent them and advise on the application
This report discusses the context of the area, the policy framework, and reason why it is considered the applications should be refused. There are sound and well established policy ground to refuse these application on, by reason of its:
A) Failure to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
B) Failure to meet the appropriate standards of architectural design as set out in the policy framework and enhance the quality of the built environment.
C) The application would cause demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties through loss of outlook, privacy and light

- 45 Dulwich Society
I have viewed the plans and elevation drawings submitted and have a number of concerns about the present proposals which do not, in my view, maintain or enhance the amenity of the Conservation Area.

Human rights implications

- 46 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.
- 47 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

Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance

- 48 N/A

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2313-6 Application file: 10-AP-3752 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: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5458 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation received

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Anthony Roberts, Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	30 June 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		5 October 2011

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 28/01/2011

Press notice date: 13/01/2011

Case officer site visit date: 11/02/2011

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 28/01/2011

Internal services consulted: None

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted: None

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

4 BEAUVAL ROAD LONDON SE22 8UQ

8 BEAUVAL ROAD LONDON SE22 8UQ

3 DOVERCOURT ROAD LONDON SE22 8SS

5 DOVERCOURT ROAD LONDON SE22 8SS

Re-consultation: None

Consultation responses received

Internal services

None

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

Neighbours and local groups

6 Dovercourt Road

The development isn't in keeping with the surrounding architecture. Suggest looking at the other loft conversion in the neighbouring houses such as no 2, no.4 and no.8, which have been built sympathetically to the style of architecture, also with the same window design which are different from the proposed plans. This objection was subsequently withdrawn.

4 Beauval Road

Objects on the grounds that the proposed extension in the loft would cause significant harm to our residential amenities by reason of its siting, scale and design, and that the design is not in keeping with the objective of the Dulwich Conservation Area to positively preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area

3 Dovercourt Road

Raises concerns about a design matching the adjoining property at no. 8 but not taking account of its own context with the adjoining neighbour at no. 4 which sits at a lower level thus resulting in overlooking as a result of the dormer extending across the outrigger. It looks out of character with other loft conversions on the road.

The council received written representation from Greer Pritchard (planning & urban design) via email on the 14 February made on behalf of Isabel & Don Marshal in relation to planning application 10/AP/3752 at 6 Beauval Road, Dulwich, London SE22. This report represents the interests and objection of immediate neighbours who live at 4 Beauval Road. They have engaged Greer Pritchard to represent them and advise on the application. This report discusses the context of the area, the policy framework, and reason why it is considered the applications should be refused. There are sound and well established policy ground to refuse these application on, by reason of its:

- a) Failure to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- b) Failure to meet the appropriate standards of architectural design as set out in the policy framework and enhance the quality of the built environment.
- c) The application would cause demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties through loss of outlook, privacy and light

Dulwich Society

I have viewed the plans and elevation drawings submitted and have a number of concerns about the present proposals which do not, in my view, maintain or enhance the amenity of the Conservation Area.