

<b>Item No.</b> 7.4	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 11 June 2013	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 13/AP/0761 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 81 WOOD VALE, LONDON, SE23 3DT  <b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a single storey extension to rear section of dwelling house to provide additional living accommodation; including demolition of an existing conservatory.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	College		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 14/03/2013		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 09/05/2013	
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b> 09/05/2013			

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant Planning Permission

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 This item is brought before the sub-committee for decision at the request of Councillors and with the agreement of the Chair of the Planning Committee

### Site location and description

- 3 The application site is an existing semi-detached dwelling situated on the west side of Wood Vale in the College Ward of Dulwich. The dwelling is two storey and has an existing conservatory structure to the rear. There is generous curtilage space to the rear of the dwelling at a length of 40m approximately. There is some off street parking to the front of the dwelling.
- 4 The site is within the suburban density zone but is otherwise unallocated within the Adopted Core Strategy proposals map.

### Details of proposal

- 5 The application is for planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling which would replace the existing conservatory. The proposed extension would extend away from the rear elevation at a full width of 8.48m. The structure would extend away from the main rear elevation by 6.13m and the rear outrigger section by 2.3m. The extension would provide additional internal space for an open plan kitchen area and would feature full length sliding glass doors. The structure would also feature an upward sloping roof canopy to the full width of the structure which would extend away from the rear elevation by 1m and would reach a total height of 3.9m. A timber decking area would lead out from the rear sliding doorway of the extension at the finished floor level of the ground floor. This would

extend out in length by 4m approximately. The boundary fence along the shared boundary with No. 83 would be raised along the decking section to a height of 2.16m when viewed from No.83 with timber infill panels.

### **Planning history**

- 6 None identified.

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

- 7 None identified.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 8 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) The potential impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.
  - b) The design and appearance of the proposed extension.

### **Planning policy**

- 9 Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 12 'Design and conservation'  
Strategic Policy 13 'High environmental standards'

- 10 Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

The Council's cabinet on 19th March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the Council satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

3.2 'Protection of amenity'  
3.11 'Efficient use of land'  
3.12 'Quality in Design'  
3.13 'Urban Design'

Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)

- 11 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF came into effect on 27 March 2012. It aims to strengthen local decision making and reinforce the importance of up-to-date plans. The policies in the NPPF are material considerations to be taken into account in making decisions on planning applications. The NPPF sets out the Governments commitment to a planning system that does everything it can do to support sustainable growth and a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

## Chapter 12 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

### **Principle of development**

- 12 The demolition of part of the existing dwelling and subsequent extension is acceptable in principle. This is provided the development does not harm the amenity of neighbouring dwellings and is of an acceptable design.

### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 13 Not required.

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

- 14 The host property is semi-detached and adjoins onto No.79 Wood Vale. This dwelling has an existing rear extension which appears to match the dimension of the proposed structure at the application site. It is acknowledged that the proposed structure has a canopy which would exceed the height of the adjacent dwellings extension. Given that the canopy stands to the north of the adjoining dwelling and is not a solid structure with no side elevation it would not lead to an unacceptable loss of sunlight or daylight to the neighbouring dwelling.
- 15 The dwelling to the north, No. 83 Wood Vale, which is detached from the application site, is similar in layout to the application site with the rear outrigger sections roughly level in terms of rear elevations. The proposed extension would therefore extend slightly beyond this rear elevation. There is an opening within this rear outrigger section which appears to serve to a kitchen area. Although situated to south of No. 83, the proposed extension would not exceed a guide line of 25 degree at plan view when drawn from the centre of the nearest opening in the rear elevation of No. 83. It is acknowledged that the proposed canopy would be visible from the openings to the rear of No.83 and from the associated curtilage space. However, given that the canopy is not a solid structure, it is not considered that the development would have an overbearing impact upon this dwelling.
- 16 The shared boundary wall along this section with No. 83 would be raised to a height of 2.16m when viewed from the neighbouring side. This is not considered an excessive height and would provide screening from the proposed decking area to the rear of the extension. The shared boundary wall would also be raised to a similar height along the boundary with No. 79. Again, it is considered that this would maintain privacy to neighbours.
- 17 It is considered that, the proposed extension, would not have a harmful impact upon the amenity of neighbouring dwellings either side of the site which would still be afforded good outlook to the rear and generous curtilage space which would not be compromised by the development. It is considered that the proposed extension accords with saved plan policy 3.02 'Protection of amenity'.

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

- 18 No impact.

### **Transport issues**

- 19 No impact.

## **Design issues**

- 20 The proposed rear extension would be contained entirely to the rear of the application site and would not be visible when viewed from the main street Wood Vale. Despite this, the extension is of a reasonable scale at similar dimensions to the extension at No. 79 Wood Vale. It is considered that the inverted canopy roof is an acceptable feature and the use of white painted render and London Stock brick to the elevations is acceptable. The design of the proposed structure is considered to be good design and accords with saved plan policy 3.12 'Quality of Design' of the Southwark Plan. Concern has been raised about the design and scale of the extension. It is acknowledged that it exceeds the dimensions given within the guidance outlined in the Residential Design Standards SPD. However each case is considered on its own merits. There is no objection to the modern approach taken, the site is not within a conservation area and would be similar in style to other extensions permitted. In terms of scale it remains subservient to the original building and is not overly dominant on the adjoining properties.

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

- 21 No impact

## **Impact on trees**

- 22 No impact.

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

- 23 N/A

## **Sustainable development implications**

- 22 None identified.

## **Other matters**

- 24 The proposed development would not constitute an increase in excess of 100sqm nor would it create additional dwellings. The application is therefore not liable for Mayoral CIL.

## **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 25 It is considered that the proposed rear extension is acceptable in terms of scale and design and would have an acceptable impact upon the amenity of adjoining neighbours. The application is recommended for approval.

## **Community impact statement**

- 26 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 issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed 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.

#### 27 Summary of consultation responses

Two objection letters were received from residents at No. 83 Wood Vale. A letter on behalf of residents at Nos. 85, 105 and 109 was also received. Details of the content of both letters is outlined below;

- Structure is in excess of householder permitted development rights
- Loss of light to outdoor amenity space at No. 83 Wood Vale
- Sense of enclosure created by structure
- No details of foundations submitted with plans
- Concern over the increase in the fence height of the existing shared boundary wall with No. 83.
- considered visually intrusive due to scale.
- Loss of outdoor amenity space.

### Human rights implications

28 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.

29 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.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2342-81 Application file: 13/AP/0761 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief executive's department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 3602 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Michael Mowbray, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	22 May 2013	
<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 Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	30 May 2013	

**Consultation undertaken**

**Site notice date:** 14th April 2013

**Press notice date:** N/A

**Case officer site visit date:** 15th May 2013

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 16th April 2013

**Internal services consulted:**

None

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

None

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

79 WOOD VALE LONDON SE23 3DT

83 WOOD VALE LONDON SE23 3DT

76 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 0QT

72 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 0QT

74 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 0QT

80 Wood Vale London SE23 3DT

78 Wood Vale London SE23 3DT

**Re-consultation:**

N/A

## Consultation responses received

### Internal services

N/A

### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

N/A

### Neighbours and local groups

Multiple letters of objection were received as a result of the publicity carried out by the Council in relation to the application. Objections were received from residents at the following addresses all on Wood Vale:

- 77
- 83 (2 letters)
- 85
- 105 (2 letters)
- 109 (3 letters)

The letters raised the following concerns:

- Structure is in excess of householder permitted development rights
- Loss of light to outdoor amenity space at No. 83 Wood Vale
- Sense of enclosure created by structure
- No details of foundations submitted with plans
- Concern over the increase in the fence height of the existing shared boundary wall with No. 83.
- considered visually intrusive due to scale.
- Loss of outdoor amenity space.

Correspondence was also received from residents at No. 79 Wood Vale which mentioned issues had been resolved between the two parties and no objection stood from residents at this property.