



Crown Copyright © Licence no. 0100019252

2	Classification OPEN	Decision Level DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL	Date 06/09/2007
From Gemma Elton		Title of Report DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	
Proposal (07-AP-1303) Conversion of main house to form 8 flats, with alterations to the windows and doors in all elevations and the provision of two new front dormers, a new dormer to each side roof plane and three new rear dormers, creating new accommodation within the basement, ground, first and second floors. Single storey rear extension and refurbishment of lodge (to remain a single dwelling), removal of rooflights from side roof plane and the replacement / provision of new doors and windows to side elevations. Provision for landscaping, 6 car parking spaces, 9 cycle parking spaces and refuse store to front. All in association with the creation of additional residential accommodation.		Address 11 SYDENHAM HILL, LONDON, SE26 6SH Ward College	

PURPOSE

- 1 To consider the above application. The application is being presented to Dulwich Community Council at Members' request and due to the number of objections received.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 Grant planning permission.

BACKGROUND

Site location and description

- 3 The application site is located on the western side of Sydenham Hill. Sydenham Hill marks the borough boundary with Lewisham Council.
- 4 The surrounding area is residential in character, with a mix of styles and sizes of buildings. The application site consists of a large Victorian single dwellinghouse built around 1864, with a separate lodge building, set with a large rear garden. The rearmost part of this garden (backing directly onto Fountain Drive to the east) does not form part of the application site for this application and is subject to a separate application for proposed development.
- 5 Due to the steeply sloping nature of the site (with the highest point fronting Sydenham Hill and falling away to Fountain Drive), the house has 2 main storeys (not including the attic rooms) as viewed from Sydenham Hill, but 3 main storeys when viewed from the rear. The house and lodge are also well elevated in relation to properties on

Fountain Drive.

- 6 The site is not within a conservation area and the property is not a listed building.

Details of proposal

- 7 The proposal involves the construction of dormer windows in the front, rear and side roof slopes of the existing Victorian house and its conversion into 8 flats, 2 flats on each floor, a mix of 6 x 2-bed and 2 x 3-bed flats.
- 8 The lodge building would be extended at ground floor level to the rear (replacing and enlarging an existing greenhouse) and used as a detached dwelling. A roof terrace which was proposed over the flat roof of the ground floor rear extension has been removed from the proposal following officer advice.
- 9 A total of 6 off-street car parking spaces would be provided; 5 including 1 disabled space for the occupiers of the converted house, and 1 designated for the occupiers of the lodge dwelling.

Planning history

- 10 Application withdrawn [07-AP-0738] dated 04/06/2007 for the conversion and extension of main house to form 8 flats, including extension by a full storey to give accommodation on basement, ground, first, second and roof storeys. Extension and refurbishment of lodge, including extensions on basement, ground and first floor rear, and use as a single family dwellinghouse. Landscaping to site, 9 car parking spaces and 12 cycle parking spaces and refuse storage to front.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 11 Application 07-AP-1328 for a two storey detached house with double garage, 2 parking spaces and 6 bike parking spaces (outline application) was pending a decision at the time of writing this report, with a recommendation for refusal.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

Main Issues

- 12 The main issues in this case are:
- a] the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.
 - b] the quality of residential accommodation provided.
 - c] design and appearance of the extensions.
 - d] parking and highway impacts.
 - e] impact on amenity of surrounding residents and local area in general.

Planning Policy

- 13 The Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007 was adopted on 28 July 2007.

- 14 Southwark Plan (UDP) 2007
3.2 Protection of Amenity
3.7 Waste Reduction
3.11 Efficient Use of Land

- 3.12 Quality in Design
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
- 4.3 Mix of Dwellings
- 5.2 Transport Impacts
- 5.3 Walking and Cycling

SPG 'Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development' (adopted 1997)

Consultations

- 15 Site Notice: 10 July 2007
- 16 Internal Consultees
Traffic Group
Waste Management
Arboriculturalist
- 17 Neighbour consultees
Lewisham Council
11, Hillside, Rideway, Fountain Drive
28 to 45 (consec) Wavel Place
9 to 15 Sydenham Hill (odds)
Flats 8, 10, 12 to 24 (consec) Hogarth Court, Fountain Drive
Flats 1 to 16 (consec) Grange Court, 12 Sydenham Hill
Flats A to I (consec) Sydenham Hill
1 to 11 (consec) Bluebell Close, Sydenham Hill
44 Murray Mews, Camden
- 18 Re-consultation: Sent 25/07/07 (14 days - amended plans)

Consultation replies

Internal Consultees

Traffic Group

- 19 Advised that further to discussions and correspondence with the applicant's architects, they do still have concerns about the low level of off-street parking proposed, however they are not formally objecting to the application because, due to the small number of units involved, they do not consider this development to have any significant transport impact overall. However they request that the following comments/concerns regarding the potential for overspill parking, due to insufficient provision of off-street parking, are brought to the attention of Members at Community Council:

- 20 The proposal is for nine residential units with six off street parking bays, one of which is for the sole use of the lodge house and one of which will be disability accessible. Leaving four bays available for seven to eight units is considered likely result in overspill parking onto the public highway.

- 21 This development is in a PTAL 2, as such 1:1 off-street residential parking provision would normally be required. It is also within Suburban Zone South, within which the Southwark Plan states that the maximum residential car parking provision within Suburban Zone South is 1.5:1 to 2:1 per unit (UDP - Table 16.4). As only 50% on the maximum (at 1:1) is being requested, the proposal is considered to be contrary to UDP policy.

Waste Management

22 Advised that 1340L of unsorted waste in 1 x 1100L and 1 x 240L bins, and 4 x 240L bins for recycling (2 x paper, 1 x glass and 1 x cans and plastics) would be acceptable. Advised as part of the previous application that the location of the proposed refuse and recycling stores was acceptable.

23 Neighbour consultees
Hillside, Fountain Drive
Supports application in principle although raises concern regarding overlooking from rear extension of lodge. In response to revised plans, supports proposal provided the ground floor extension to the lodge is kept within the bounds of the current greenhouse.

24 Northside, 11 Fountain Drive
Object as the amount of development appears excessive. Concerned that daylight/sunlight will be reduced, particularly in mornings, loss of privacy due to more people looking out of windows and the use of dormer windows rather than velux in the roof, and increased noise due to increased numbers of occupiers. Concerned that trees will be removed. Also object to a building in the garden space and impacts of this: *Note - This is not part of this proposal but subject to a separate application.*

25 13 Sydenham Hill
Concerned about increased nuisance due to increased comings and goings with more households occupying the building - including vehicle noise, odour from bins, light pollution, noise from increased numbers of people using the garden, loss of privacy due to overlooking particularly from the dormer windows and terrace at the lodge (note: this has subsequently been removed from the proposal) and increased number of occupants. Concerned about impact on highway safety due to position of access close to corner and near bus stops, and inadequate on- and off-street parking resulting in overspill parking. Concerned about impacts on sewerage system and lack of provision for waste storage/collection and measures to reduce water demand.

26 12 Sydenham Hill
Support the application provided no major trees, shrubs or bushes would be removed or cut back.

27 4 Bluebell Close
Object as 6 parking spaces does not seem sufficient.

28 Flat 1 Grange Court, 12 Sydenham Hill
Do not consider the proposal would impact on them.

29 Flat 2 Grange Court, 12 Sydenham Hill
Supports the conversion providing the original character of the house is maintained. Also queries whether the mature tree to the front of the property will be retained if this area is to be used for car parking.

30 Lewisham Council
Raised no objections.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

31 **Principle of development**
Policy 4.3 provides protection against the loss of small family dwellinghouses, as there is an identified need for this type of accommodation within the borough. However, there are no policies to specifically retain larger houses as single residences and, as such, there is no objection to the principle of the conversion of this single dwelling into

flats.

- 32 The mix of size of units is acceptable as it provides a majority of 2-bed and over units in accordance with Policy 4.3.

Quality of accommodation

- 33 Each of the flats provide, or are very close to, the minimum floor areas required for the size of each size of residential unit. The layout is logical and in light of this the slight shortfall is not significant enough to justify refusal on grounds of poor accommodation.

- 34 Two of the flats would be contained within the basement, however due to the steep slope of the site, this would effectively be the ground floor at the rear of the building. The bedrooms are located at the front, and would be provided with 2 new windows at the front basement level with a lightwell (not visible when viewed from the street) and would also have windows in the side elevations. Excavation would be carried out to the south of the main building to allow for this side window to be set above the adjoining external ground level. The presence of the additional side windows is considered to provide sufficient light to these front bedrooms.

- 35 The rooms in the roofspace are provided with good average head height and each room with the exception of the bathrooms, would be provided with dormer windows. Living rooms would also be provided with rooflights and as such, this is considered to provide satisfactory light and outlook for these flats.

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

Intensification of use of site

- 36 The existing house is particularly large and while an increase in the number of occupiers is by its nature going to increase the number of comings and goings etc., what must be considered is whether this would be to an unreasonable extent or whether the impacts would not be demonstrably harmful and balanced by making an efficient use of the land.

- 37 The potential number of occupiers would not be unusual for residential use within a building of this scale and each of the flats provide at least 2 bedrooms and a decent standard of accommodation for future occupiers. Policy 3.11 requires all developments to ensure that they maximise the efficient use of land. With these factors in mind, it is not considered that the proposed level of use would amount to an overdevelopment of the site in terms of number of occupiers such that refusal could be sustained on these grounds.

Main house

- 38 The dormer windows to the rear would look out onto the rear garden area which is subject of a separate planning application for new development. Existing houses either side of the rear garden are set at an angle from the direction the dormers would directly face and are set 18m and 43m from the existing house. This, together with the good degree of screening by vegetation, means that opportunities for overlooking are not considered to result in demonstrable harm by loss of privacy to properties at the rear.

- 39 Given the high position of the side dormers in comparison to the houses positioned directly either side on Sydenham Hill, views would be to the longer distance rather than direct overlooking.

- 40 There is a block of flats to the south of No.9 which would be faced by the southern side dormer given their greater height in comparison to No.9. The 28m separation between windows is considered sufficient not to result in loss of privacy.

Lodge

- 41 The proposal has been amended since its original submission: reduction in the extension of the rear of the lodge from all floors to ground floor only with a roof terrace over the flat roof, then a further revision submitted to remove the roof terrace.
- 42 The removal of the roof terrace is considered to be a significant improvement as this element raised serious concerns regarding overlooking and increased disturbance to neighbours. The single storey extension to the lodge, although larger than the existing greenhouse in terms of depth (5.1m proposed compared to 3.6m existing) and bulk (the maximum height would remain at the same point however a flat roof would be incorporated rather than a mono-pitch) is not considered to substantially increase opportunities for overlooking than the use of existing lodge provided that adequate screening is provided along the part of the southern site boundary closest to the proposed extension. It is recommended that a condition of approval be the approval of details of this screening which could be by physical (e.g. fence) screening or landscaping, or a combination of both.

Traffic issues

- 43 The issue of car parking provision has been raised by the Council's Traffic Group and local residents. In this location (PTAL 2, Suburban Zone), the maximum car parking standard is 1.5:1 to 2:1 per unit. Although Traffic Group would generally require 1:1 provision - which the provision here of 6 spaces for 9 units falls short of - they do not formally object to this proposal due to the small number of units involved. While there may be potential for some overspill parking to occur it is not considered that this would have such a significant impact that refusal of this scheme would be warranted.
- 44 An advantage of providing a smaller number of car parking spaces is that part of the area to the front of the property would be retained as landscaping rather than covered in hard-surfacing. From a visual amenity perspective this is far preferable and from an environmental perspective also contributes to reducing additional surface run-off.

Design issues

- 45 There is currently one dormer on the front roofslope, positioned centrally. This would be removed with 2 new dormers positioned symmetrically above existing windows on the front elevation, 1 dormer on each side elevation and 3 dormers in the rear roofslope.
- 46 In principle, there is no design objection to the proposal as the changes are minor and not considered to compromise the character and appearance of the building. However, the existing house is considered to have an important presence and landmark quality within the streetscape, and for this reason it is essential that quality materials are used, to be controlled by Condition.

Planning obligations [S.106 undertaking or agreement]

- 47 Planning obligations including affordable housing provision are not required as this proposal falls under the 10 unit threshold (Policy 4.4).

Other matters

Trees

- 48 There are several mature trees on the site, the applicant has confirmed that no works are proposed to any of the trees.

Refuse

- 49 The location of the refuse stores is identified on the submitted plans, at the north-easternmost part of the site. The location, amount and type of provision is acceptable to the Council's Waste Management section.

Sewers

50 This is not a material planning consideration, but covered by separate legislation.

Conclusion

51 The proposal is considered acceptable having regard to the relevant planning policies and other material planning considerations as discussed above. It is therefore recommended for approval.

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

52 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] There are no issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected.

c] There are no likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

53 The proposal makes efficient use of land in line with the principles of sustainable development.

LEAD OFFICER	Gary Rice	Head of Development and Building Control
REPORT AUTHOR	Gemma Elton	Planning Officer Development Control [tel. 020 7525 5365]
CASE FILE	TP/2345-11	
Papers held at:	Regeneration Department, Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES [tel. 020 7525 5403]	

RECOMMENDATION LDD MONITORING FORM REQUIRED

This document shows the case officer's recommended decision for the application referred to below.
This document is not a decision notice for this application.

Applicant Bespoke Homes
Application Type Full Planning Permission
Recommendation Grant

Reg. Number 07-AP-1303

Case Number TP/2345-11

Draft of Decision Notice

Planning Permission was GRANTED for the following development:

Conversion of main house to form 8 flats, with alterations to the windows and doors in all elevations and the provision of two new front dormers, a new dormer to each side roof plane and three new rear dormers, creating new accommodation within the basement, ground, first and second floors. Single storey rear extension and refurbishment of lodge (to remain a single dwelling), removal of rooflights from side roof plane and the replacement / provision of new doors and windows to side elevations. Provision for landscaping, 6 car parking spaces, 9 cycle parking spaces and refuse store to front. All in association with the creation of additional residential accommodation.

At: 11 SYDENHAM HILL, LONDON, SE26 6SH

**In accordance with application received on 06/06/2007
and revisions/amendments received on 10/08/2007
13/08/2007
20/08/2007**

and Applicant's Drawing Nos. 015-001 Rev D, 015-003, 015-004, 015-005, 015-006, 015-011, 015-012, 015-013, 015-014, 015-015, 015-016 Rev A, 015-017 Rev A, 015-021, 015-022, 015-031 Rev C, 015-032 Rev F, 015-033 Rev A, 015-034 Rev C, 015-035 Rev A, 015-036 Rev A, 015-SCH Rev B, 015-041 Rev B, 015-042 Rev B, 015-043 Rev A, 015-044 Rev D, 015-045 Rev C, 015-046 Rev C, 015-047 Rev C, 015-051 Rev A, 015-052 Rev B, 015-053, 015-060, 015-061 Rev A, 015-062

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the end of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason

As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended

- 2 Before any works in connection with this development are commenced, details of the proposed boundary screening between the application site and the property known as Hillside, Fountain Drive, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boundary treatment could consist of physical structure(s) and/or a scheme of appropriate landscaping, and shall be put in place prior to the first occupation of the lodge and retained thereafter.

Reason

In the interest of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity and 3.11 Efficient Use of Land of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.

- 3 All new external works and finishes and works of making good shall match existing original work adjacent in respect of materials used (particularly the existing roof-slates), detailed execution and finished appearance, except where indicated otherwise on the drawings hereby approved.

Reason

In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the design and details in the interest of the special architectural or historic qualities of the listed building in accordance with Policies 3.12 Quality in Design and 3.13 Urban Design of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.

Reasons for granting planning permission.

This planning application was considered with regard to various policies including, but not exclusively:

a] Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.7 Waste Reduction, 3.11 Efficient Use of Land, 3.12 Quality in Design, 3.13 Urban Design, 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation, 4.3 Mix of Dwellings, 5.2 Transport Impacts and 5.3 Walking and Cycling of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007 and SPG 'Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development' (adopted 1997).

Planning permission was granted as there are no, or insufficient, grounds to withhold consent on the basis of the policies considered and other material planning considerations.