

<b>Item No.</b> <b>30/07</b>	<b>Classification</b> OPEN	<b>DECISION LEVEL</b> PLANNING COMMITTEE	<b>Date</b> 04/03/2003
<b>From</b> DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING CONTROL MANAGER		<b>Title of Report</b> DEVELOPMENT CONTROL Full Planning Application	
<b>Proposal</b> (02-AP-1952)  Single storey rear extension, first floor side extension with loft conversion comprising rear dormer RE-SUBMISSION		<b>Address</b>  109 Court Lane SE21  Village Ward	

## 1. **PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To consider the above application which is for Committee consideration because of the number of neighbour letters received objecting to the proposal.

## 2. **RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Grant Planning Permission

## 3. **BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of Court Lane in a residential area. The house is not listed or located within a Conservation Area.
- 3.2 The proposal is for the erection of single storey rear extension, a first floor side extension and a dormer window.
- 3.3 The application does not include the garden shed proposed at the back of the garden, this can be constructed under permitted development.
- 3.4 In March 1999 planning permission was refused for the erection of a first floor side extension, single storey rear extension, rear roof extension and first floor and roof level balconies at the rear. The application was refused because the size and position of the extensions would have been overbearing in relation to the adjoining occupiers and would have caused an unacceptable loss of light and privacy. In addition the proposed extensions were excessively large and would have detracted from the character of the original dwelling.
- 3.5 In March 2000 planning permission was refused for the erection of a ground floor rear extension, side extension at first floor level and dormer window in the rear roof slope. The application was refused because it would have created an undesirable terracing effect which would have been out of character with and detrimental to the visual appearance of the streetscene.
- 3.6 In September 2002 a further planning permission was refused for the erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and dormer window to the rear roof slope. The application was refused because of the excessive size of the extensions which would have resulted in an adverse effect on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers and the design which was considered to be out of character with the rear street scene.

- 3.7 This current application has been amended and the superceded plans have been submitted in response to the advice of the planning department and the concerns of the neighbours. Although the description is the same, the size and design of that proposed has been significantly altered.

#### **4. FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION**

##### **4.1 Main Issues**

The main issues for consideration on this case are the design of the proposed extensions and their impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and streetscape and any potential impacts on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

##### **4.2 Planning Policy**

Southwark Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

Policy E 2.3 Aesthetic Control – Complies

Policy E 3.1 Protection of Amenity – Complies

Policy H.1.8 Standards for New Housing – Complies

SPG No. 5 Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development – Complies

Southwark Plan (Draft Deposit November2002):

Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity - Complies

Policy 3.14 Quality in Design - Complies

Policy 4.2 Residential Design Standards - Complies

SPG 6.2 Residential Design Standards - Complies

##### **4.3 Consultations**

Site Notice: Not required

Press Notice: Not required

Consultees:

107, 111 Court Lane, SE21 7EE

132, 134, 136 Court Lane SE21 7EB

21, 23A, 23B, 23C, 25 Eynella Road, SE21 8XF

**Replies from:**

105 Court Lane: Raises concerns over the "terracing" created by the first floor side extension to the appearance and character of the house in relation to the street. The proposed extensions are disproportionate to the existing house and would result in a loss of light.

107 Court Lane: Raises concerns over the potential loss of light to the rear of their property and concerned that the side extension would create a 'terrace' style appearance to the front of the property.

111 Court Lane:Raises concerns over the "terracing" effect created by the first floor side extension, loss of privacy by potential overlooking from the rear roof dormer, loss of light and the closeness of the proposed rear extension to the boundary.

132 Court Lane:Raises concerns over the "terracing" effect created by the first floor side extension and loss of character to the street scene.

The objectors were notified of the amendments and given 14 days to respond. The above comments

are in response to the original plans submitted and not the amended drawings.

#### 4.4 **Planning Considerations**

##### 4.4.1 **Proposed dormer window**

The proposed dormer window would be 1.7m wide, 1.8m in height and extend off the roof slope a maximum of 1.5m. It would have a pitched roof with tiles to match the existing house and would have two windows. The applicant was advised to amend the dormer so that the window would not have any glazing bars to improve its appearance. The applicant has done this on the amended drawings.

The proposed dormer window would not allow for over-looking to an unacceptable level and differs little from the over-looking potential that already exists from the bedroom windows. There are a number of properties along Court Lane with similar dormer style roof extensions. The design is acceptable and would not look inappropriate in relation to the style of the existing house.

##### 4.4.2 **Proposed first floor side extension**

The proposed side extension would be constructed above the existing garage that runs along the side elevation of the house. It would be 1.8m wide which is less than the width of the garage, leaving a gap of 0.75m with the side elevation of the neighbouring property at Number 107 Court Lane. It would be 5.4m in length, be the same height as the first floor of the existing house and its roof would be 0.9m lower than the roof of the existing house. The render and roof tiles would match those of the existing house.

The side extension has been amended considerably in terms of its size and design following the advice of the Council's design officer. It now proposes to be set back over 3m from the front of the house (as apposed to 0.75m shown on the original application) behind the original 1920's brick arch above the garage. This architectural feature would now be retained as would the pitched brick garage elevation at the rear. The proposed roof on the original drawing was only slightly lower than that of the existing roof of the house. The roof shown on the amended drawing would be almost a metre lower than the original roof proposed in this application. These amendments were requested to minimise the concerns of the neighbours regarding the creation of a 'terracing effect.' It is considered that the amended plans achieve this and it should be noted that a number of the semi-detached houses along Court Lane have extensions over their garages that are larger than that proposed in this application.

The proposed first floor side extension would not have a negative impact on the character of the street-scene. There would be relatively little if any noticeable impact on the amount of daylight/sunlight to the neighbouring properties and the original 1920's architectural feature above the garage would be retained. It is set back sufficiently to have a minimal impact on both the appearance and character of the existing house and streetscene and the amenity of the neighbouring property at Number 107. The amendments made are more than comparable.

##### 4.4.3 **Proposed rear extension:**

The proposed rear extension would have a sloped roof and would be between 2.5m and 3.4m in height. It would extend 3m off the existing rear elevation and would be 6.65m wide (the original rear extension proposed was 8.5m wide, almost the entire width of the rear). The amended rear extension would be set back 2.5m from the boundary with Number 107 where as the original extension proposed was at its closest 0.7m from the boundary. The walls would be constructed in brick and render to match the existing house, would have a sliding french doors and a window with three glazing bars on the elevation facing the garden.

The proposed extension is set back off both boundaries with the neighbouring properties. There are no doors or windows on the proposed extension that would face onto 107 or 111 Court Lane. There

would not be any negative impacts on the amount of light into the rear of either of the neighbours properties and no negative impacts on the neighbour's amenity. The proposed design is acceptable and would not detract from the character, or over dominate the existing house.

#### 4.4.4 Conclusion:

This application has sought to provide a compromise with the neighbours as well as provide the additional accommodation wanted by the applicant. The design of all the new additions to the house are now considered acceptable and a significant improvement on the original proposal and previous applications. The application is considered to be acceptable and is recommended for approval.

### 5. **EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 None

### 6. **LOCAL AGENDA 21 [Sustainable Development] IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 None

LEAD OFFICER:	Andrew Cook	Development & Building Control Manager
REPORT AUTHOR:	Karen Page	Planning Officer [0207 525 5434]
CASE FILE:	TP/1383-38A	
PAPERS HELD AT:	Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street, London SE17 2ES (tel no 0207 525 5402)	