

<b>Item No.</b> 7.3	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 7 October 2015	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 15/AP/2091 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 64 BEAUVAL ROAD, LONDON SE22 8UQ  <b>Proposal:</b> Side return and part rear extension		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Village		
<b>From:</b>	Director of Planning		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 16/06/2015		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 11/08/2015	
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b> 02/08/2015			

### RECOMMENDATION

1. Planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The application is reported to Planning Sub-Committee following a referral request from Members.

### Site location and description

3. The application site refers to a two-storey mid terrace dwellinghouse located on the western side of Beauval Road. The property has an existing small single storey rear extension set on the back of its two-storey rear addition and benefits from a relatively large rear garden.
4. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character. The property is within the Dulwich Village Conservation Area but is not within the setting of a listed building and is not listed itself.

### Details of proposal

5. Full planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and erection of a new single storey rear and side extension that wraps around the two storey rear addition.
6. The proposed rear extension would extend out from the elevation of the rear outrigger by 2.56m, constructed with a flat roof at a height of 3m.
7. The proposed side infill extension would measure 8.86m in length, constructed of a pitched roof of which height on the boundary with No.62 has been amended during the planning process from 2.8m to 2.24m. Since the application site is on a higher land level, the side extension would read 2.486m from the ground level of No. 62.

8. Proposed materials would include reclaimed yellow London stock brick and duraslide sliding rear doors.

### **Planning history**

9. No previous panning records

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

10. 62 Beauval Road  
No planning records
11. 66 Beauval Road  
No planning records
12. 68a Beauval Road  
15/AP/0618: Planning application for erection of a single storey side and rear extension is referred to the planning sub-committee in October 2015 for re-consideration at the request of members.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

13. 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) The impact of the development on the amenity of the adjoining properties.
  - c) Design Quality
  - d) Impact on Dulwich Village Conservation Area.
  - e) All other relevant material planning considerations.

### **Planning policy**

14. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
Section 7 - Requiring good design  
Section 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
15. London Plan 2015 consolidated with alterations since 2011  
Policy 7.4 - Local Character  
Policy 7.6 - Architecture
16. Core Strategy 2011  
Strategic policy 12 - Design and conservation  
Strategic policy 13 - High environmental standards
17. Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies  
The council's cabinet on 19 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.

Policy 3.2 - Protection of amenity

Policy 3.12 - Quality in design

Policy 3.13 - Urban design

Policy 3.16 - Conservation areas

Policy 3.18 - Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites

Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)

Dulwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

### **Principle of development**

18. There is no objection in principle to alterations to residential properties in established residential areas provided that development is of a high standard of design, respects and enhances the character of its surroundings including any designated heritage assets and does not adversely impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties or residents in accordance with above mentioned development policies.

### **Summary of consultation responses**

19. One objection received:
  - The owner of No.66 objected to the application, as they disagree with some of the comments made in the Design and Access Statement. Firstly, the Statement states the extension will meet the building line of No 66. The building line between No 66 and No 68 extends approximately 1m to the rear, but the plans submitted show a 2 m extension (No 66 has never been extended and is almost identical to No 64). Secondly, there is a list of adjacent precedents. None of the precedents listed are of a similar L shaped proposal, comprising a side return, fill-in and 2 m extension to the rear (see also comments made in this regard in respect to planning application 15/AP/0618 No 68A Beauval Road).

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

20. Saved policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure an adequate standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers; Strategic Policy 13 High Environmental Standards requires development to comply with the highest possible environmental standards, including in sustainability, flood risk, noise and light pollution and amenity problems. The Council's Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 also sets out the guidance for rear extensions which states that development should not unacceptably affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.
21. The council's residential design standards SPD set out guidance for extensions to a dwellinghouse which should not exceed 3m in depth and 3m in height, so as to prevent a feeling of enclosure and harm to neighbours.
22. The owner of No.66 is concerned that the development would extend beyond their building line to the rear. The proposed rear extension would extend out from the elevation of the rear addition by 2.56m and project 3m in height, which complies with the requirements as set out in the SPD. Furthermore, given the scale and massing, the rear extension element, if undertaken on its own without the side infill, would fall within the scope of permitted development, not requiring planning consent.

23. No.62 has a two-storey rear addition where 1x side window and 1x rear glazed door on the ground floor that appear to serve the kitchen would be affected given its close proximity to the development. A sunlight and daylight test conducted by Case Officer via drawing a line at 45 degrees sideways from the centre of the affected window of No.62 demonstrates that the side extension would fall within the shadow of the 45 degree line, meaning that the development would not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to the affected openings of No.62.
24. The amended scheme would be just under 2.5m in height relative to the slightly lower ground levels at No. 62, which is considered to be acceptable in these circumstances, given that on the applicants' side the height has been dropped to just over 2.2m.
25. Based on the above assessment, the development is considered acceptable in amenity terms.

### **Transport issues**

26. None

### **Design issues**

27. Strategic Policy 12 of the Core Strategy (2011) seeks to achieve the highest possible standards of design for buildings. Saved Policies 3.12 'Quality in Design' and 3.13 'Urban Design', together, seek to achieve high quality architectural and urban design which enhances the quality of the built environment. The Council's Residential Design Standards 2011 provides general guidance on residential extensions to harmonise their scale, impact and architectural style. Section 7 paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development while paragraph 58 goes on to states that *'planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments... respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials'*.
28. The council's adopted 'Dulwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2013 sets out the guidance that should be required when considering proposals for extensions that require planning permission. Section 5.6 'Extensions' states:
  - 5.6.2: Where extensions are proposed, they should be in keeping with the character of the area and for the most part follow the guidance set out in the residential design standards SPD. In some cases, however, larger development that exceeds the 3 metres by 3 metre threshold set out in the SPD could be considered. In particular detached and semi-detached properties with substantial gardens may accommodate a larger extension providing the openness of an area is not compromised, the design is clearly subservient to the main part of a building and it would not add appreciably to the building's bulk.
29. The application site is located within the Dulwich Village Conservation Area. The proposed structure would be single storey, set within the rear garden of the site. Given the low eaves height of the side extension, the bulk and scale of the proposal is considered acceptable, and would not form a dominating feature to the host building. The proposed materials would complement the host building which is acceptable.
30. The owners of No.66 also concerned that there is a list of adjacent precedents, none of which of a similar L shaped proposal, comprising a side return, fill-in and 2 m extension to the rear. However, it is acknowledged that similar developments have been recently granted within the adjoining properties, including:
  - No.27 Beauval Road (Ref: 12/AP/3037): The side and rear infill extension would

measure 8m in length and 2.2m in height on the boundary with No.25. It is noted that No.25 is on a lower land level

- No.61 Beauval Road (Ref: 12/AP/0266/): The scheme would measure 8.2m in length and 3.2m in height to its eaves level; It is noted that No.61 is situated on a corner plot, and the proposed side extension would not adjoin any properties.
- No.77 Beauval Road (Ref: 10/AP/0196): The proposal would measure 5.09m in length x 3m in height to parapet level.

31. The proposal is broadly comparable in projection and height to these granted extensions and on consideration of these applications it was considered that the character and appearance of these houses would be preserved, subject to suitable materials.

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

32. Saved Policy 3.16 'Conservation areas' asserts that within conservation areas, development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. Saved Policy 3.18 'Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites', states that Permission will not be granted for developments that would not preserve or enhance:

- i. The immediate or wider setting of a listed building; or
- ii. An important view(s) of a listed building; or
- iii. The setting of the Conservation Area.

33. The application site is located within the Dulwich Village conservation area. Officers consider that the proposed rear extension cannot be viewed from a public point of access and an extension of this scale would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, subject to materials being sympathetic, i.e. bricks to match existing and appropriate roofing material that avoids felt or plastic covering.

34. It is therefore considered that subject to conditions, the proposal is acceptable and would preserve the character and appearance of the existing building and the conservation area.

#### **Impact on trees**

35. None

#### **Sustainable development implications**

36. Not applicable

#### **Other matters**

37. S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL as a material 'local financial consideration' in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail. The application is not CIL liable because it is not constituted as chargeable development under the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

## **Community impact statement**

38. The impacts of this application have been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of the “protected characteristics”, as set out in the Equality Act 2010, the council's community impact statement and Southwark Council's approach to equality: delivering a fairer future for all, being age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex (a man or a woman), and sexual orientation.
39. In assessing this application, the council has consulted those most likely to be affected as part of the application process and considered these protected characteristics when material to this proposal.
  - a) The following protected characteristics or groups have been identified as most likely to be affected by this proposal: none.

## **Consultations**

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

## **Consultation replies**

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

## **Human rights implications**

42. 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.
43. This application has the legitimate aim of providing a rear and side 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.

## **Conclusion on planning and other issues**

44. The proposed development is not considered to result in significant harm to the amenities of the adjoining neighbours. The overall design is also considered acceptable within this context and subject to conditions would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such, it is recommended that the application be approved.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2313-64 Application file: 15/AP/2091 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 5403 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>	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
<b>Report Author</b>	Marina Lai, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	20 August 2015	
<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, finance & 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>		25 September 2015

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

**Site notice date:** 10/07/2015

**Press notice date:** 02/07/2015

**Case officer site visit date:** 22/07/2015

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 24/06/2015

**Internal services consulted:**

n/a

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

Thames Water - Development Planning

**Neighbour and local groups consulted:**

66 Beauval Road London SE22 8UQ

62 Beauval Road London SE22 8UQ  
51 Dovercourt Road London SE22 8SS

**Re-consultation:** n/a



## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

None

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Thames Water - Development Planning

#### Neighbours and local groups

66 Beauval Road London SE22 8UQ