Item No. 6.3	Classification: OPEN	Date: 24 Nover	mber 2011	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council		
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-2573 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 48 HOLLINGBOURNE ROAD, LONDON, SE24 9ND Proposal: Erection of an 'L' shaped single storey ground floor rear extension to infill existing side return and to part of rear elevation of house, new external patio to rear garden, new brick boundary wall to end of patio to no. 46 side and new brick boundary wall to full length of garden to no. 50 side.					
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Village					
From:	Head of Development Management					
Application Start Date 16 August 2011 Application Expiry Date 11 October 201						

RECOMMENDATION

1 Grant planning permission.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2 The application is for consideration by Dulwich Community Council as three letters of objection have been received.

Site location and description

3 The site refers to a two storey, single family dwelling house on the western side of Hollingbourne Road. The site is not listed, nor is it situated within a Conservation Area.

Details of proposal

- 4 Erection of a single storey ground floor side and rear extension measuring 5500m in total length, projecting 2500mm from the rear elevation of the property, 5000mm in width and 2400mm in height to eaves level on the boundary with No.46 Hollingbourne Road. The construction of a new boundary wall between No.48 and 50, the raising of the garden/patio level immediately to the rear of the property by 20cm.
- 5 The applicant has amended the proposals introducing a hipped roof to the side extension reducing the height on the boundary, decreasing the height of the boundary wall between 48 and 50 to a maximum height of 2m, omitting the overhanging roof which was first proposed and the pergola roof over the terrace area.

Planning history

6 No planning history.

Planning history of adjoining sites

7 None relevant.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 8 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) The impact on amenity of neighbouring residents.
 - b) The design and appearance of the extension.

Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

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

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

10 Policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' Policy 3.12 'Quality in Design' Policy 3.13 'Urban Design'

Residential Design Guidance SPD 2011

London Plan 2011

11 None relevant.

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

12 None relevant.

Principle of development

13 The principle of extending residential dwellings for the purposes of providing additional residential accommodation is considered acceptable provided that the scale of the proposal is appropriate within its context, having regard in particular to impacts on character and appearance of the site and surrounds, and impacts on residential amenities.

Environmental impact assessment

14 Not required with an application of this nature.

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

15 The single storey side and rear extension is proposed to a height of 2400mm to eaves level on the boundary with the adjoining property No.46 Hollingbourne Road. There are substantial differences in the height of the ground level between the two properties, the ground level to 46 is substantially lower than the application property, but the window in the rear elevation is actually higher. Therefore the height of 2.4m to eaves level on the boundary is considered acceptable; it is not considered that the height of the extension will have a detrimental impact on the property in terms of loss of light or outlook to warrant the refusal of the application given that there are no windows in the side elevation of the outrigger, and the height of window in the rear elevation.

16 The proposal also includes a new boundary wall between the application site and the adjoining property No.50 Hollingbourne Road and the raising of the patio/garden level immediately to the rear of the site by 200mm. The height of the boundary varies given the uneven ground between the properties, however will not exceed 2m in height on the application side. There is a difference in height of 600mm between the garden levels of each property however, given that a wall or fence to a height of 2m and the raising of the ground up to 30cm would be considered permitted development the effect on the amenity of the adjoining neighbour cannot be considered a reason for refusal of the application.

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

17 The property will remain in use as a single family dwelling house.

Traffic issues

18 None.

Design issues

- 19 The concerns over the design of the extension have been alleviated following the removal of the overhanging roof and the pergola which further extended to the rear.
- 20 The revised plans reduce the bulk and scale of the proposed extension on the original dwelling. The extension is proposed with stock brick to match the host dwelling, with a mid grey glass reinforced plastic roof, and timber framed doors and fixed glazed panels. The extension will read as a modern addition to the building and is therefore considered acceptable.
- 21 Concerns have been raised by neighbours regarding the height of the extension given the difference in ground levels and the effect of the extension therefore on the appearance of the rear elevation of the terrace. However, given that the property is not situated within a Conservation Area and the extension is not visible from public views, it is not considered that the brick and majority glazed extension will have a major detrimental impact on the appearance of the rear of the terrace to warrant a refusal of the application.

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

22 The property is not listed nor is it situated within a Conservation Area.

Impact on trees

23 None.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

24 Not required with an application of this nature.

Sustainable development implications

25 None.

Other matters

26 No other matters identified.

Conclusion on planning issues

27 It is not considered that the proposed rear 'L' shaped extension will have a detrimental impact on the adjoining properties, the design of the extension is considered acceptable following amendments to the original scheme and therefore it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

Community impact statement

- 28 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.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 32 3 objections received.
- 33 Owners of 50 Hollingbourne Road which adjoins the property to the south object to the application on the grounds that the proposed works will have a detrimental effect on their property, namely the proposed boundary wall and the raised patio which they consider will affect their privacy. As discussed above the wall height has been reduced to a maximum height of 2m and the raised patio to a height of 20cm which would fall within permitted development rights and therefore cannot be considered as a reason for refusal. No.50 also objected on the grounds that the addition is out of keeping with other residences in the local area.
- 34 A second objection was received from No.44 Hollingbourne Road who raised concerns over the height of the extension and the precedent for further development in the terrace of the same nature. The objection based on the height of the extension is due to the changes in ground level and therefore the dominance the proposed extension has on the rear elevation of the terrace.
- 35 A third objection was received from another neighbour who withheld their address. This objection is in line with that of No.44 that the extension will set a precedent for others in the terrace. They highlight that the extension beyond the rear building line has yet to take place on other properties in the vicinity.

36 A letter of support for the application was received from the adjoining property to the north, No.46 Hollingbourne Road. The Owners of 46 support the application as they state that the height and extent of the extension is not problematic as they wish to carry out a similar project to their property.

Human rights implications

- 37 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.
- 38 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

39 N/A

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact	
Site history file: TP/2098-48	Regeneration and	Planning enquiries telephone:	
	Neighbourhoods	020 7525 5403	
Application file: 11-AP-2573	Department	Planning enquiries email:	
	160 Tooley Street	planning.enquiries@southwark.gov	
Southwark Local Development	London	<u>.uk</u>	
Framework and Development	SE1 2TZ	Case officer telephone:	
Plan Documents		020 7525 5560	
		Council website:	
		www.southwark.gov.uk	

APPENDICES

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

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management					
Report Author	Anna Clare, Planning Officer					
Version	Final					
Dated	27 October 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 Neighbourhoods	Regeneration and	No	No			
Strategic Director of Leisure	Environment and	No	No			
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team24 November 2011						

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 25/08/2011

Press notice date: N/A

Case officer site visit date: 25/08/11

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 24/08/11

Internal services consulted: None

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted: None

Neighbours and local groups consulted: see list in Acolaid.

Re-consultation: Reconsultation carried out 24/10/11 following revision of drawings.

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

N/A

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

N/A

Neighbours and local groups

3 letters of objection, 1 letter in support as outlined above.