

Item No.	Classification:	Meeting Date:	Meeting Name:
1	OPEN	12 October 2010	Dulwich Community Council
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 10-AP-1738 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 68A CRAWTHEW GROVE, LONDON, SE22 9AB Proposal: Demolition of existing single storey commercial storage building and erection of a two storey two bedroom dwelling house.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	East Dulwich		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 21/06/2010		Application Expiry Date 16 August 2010	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The application is before members as five letters of objection have been received.

Site location and description

- 2 The application site comprises a part two, part single storey building comprising timber and corrugated iron covering most of a triangular site, measuring 195 sq.m, wedged between Nos. 68 and 70 Crawthrew Grove. The property is in a predominantly residential area characterised by two storey late Victorian terraced housing. The two storey element of the existing structure at No. 68a faces the road and is characterised by a large door providing access to the structure at ground floor level. There is a high brick wall on the western boundary abutting No. 70 Crawthrew Grove which runs to the rear of the small gardens of the mews development at Nos. 72a-c Crawthrew Grove. There are no windows or openings on the east elevation of No. 70, which has been converted into flats. The original two storey rear addition of No. 68 has two small windows at first floor and a bay window at ground floor facing the application site.

Details of proposal

- 3 Demolition of existing single storey commercial storage building and erection of a two storey two bedroom dwelling house.
- 4 Application 08-AP-1833 was refused on three grounds in December 2008 by the Dulwich Community Council for the erection of a new three storey building incorporating two self contained flats.
- 5 The current application is for the erection of a two storey dwelling house and differs from the previously refused application in the following ways:

- A two storey single dwelling house with two bedrooms is proposed as opposed to a three storey building comprising two flats.
- Alterations to the roof form being a flat roof as opposed to a part gable, part hip roof.

6 Planning history

Reg. No.	Type	Description	Summary	Date
06/AP/2070	FUL	Erection of a two storey building comprising 2x2 bedroom self contained units.	Refused	22/02/2007
07/AP/0769	FUL	Erection of a two-storey building comprising 2 x 2-bedroom dwellinghouses (RE-SUBMISSION)	Refused	26/06/2007
07/AP/1719	FUL	Erection of a two-storey building comprising 2 x 2-bedroom dwellinghouses (RE-SUBMISSION).	Withdrawn	11/04/2008
08/AP/1833	FUL	Erection of a new three storey building incorporating two self contained flats (1 two bedroom flat and 1 one bedroom flat).	Refused	18/12/2008

7 08-AP-1833: In December 2008 the Dulwich Community Council refused an application for the erection of a new two storey building incorporating two self contained flats. The three reasons for refusal were:

1. The roof form of the proposed new building by reason of its mass, bulk and detailed design, would fail to respond positively to its surroundings, its inappropriate scale and design particularly when viewed straight on would appear incongruous within the street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of amenity, 3.11 Efficient use of land, 3.12 Quality in design and 3.13 Urban design of the Southwark Plan 2007.

2. The quality of the upper maisonette would be unduly compromised in the absence of any external private space. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.11 Efficient use of land and 4.2 Quality of Accommodation of the Southwark Plan 2007 and the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2008).

3. The proposed units would fail to provide or identify a suitable area for the secure storage of bicycles as such the proposal is contrary to Policy 5.3 'Walking and Cycling' of the Southwark Plan (2007) and the Transport Planning for Sustainable Development Supplementary Planning Document (2008).

8 07-AP-0769: In June 2007 planning permission was refused for the erection of a two storey building comprising 2 two bedroom self contained units. The two reasons for refusal were:

1. The proposed residential development by reason of the narrow frontage and 4 metre setback between two 2-storey buildings would result in poor quality accommodation to the future occupiers in respect of outlook and light to the main bedrooms of both units. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' and Policy 4.2 'Quality of Residential Accommodation' of the Southwark Plan (Modifications Version) and Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' and H.1.8 'Standards for New Housing' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan adopted July 1995 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 1997 No.5: Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development.

2. The proposed building by reason of its detailed front elevation would be out of character within the terrace resulting in a visually intrusive impact upon the streetscene and upon neighbouring properties contrary to Policy 3.11 'Quality in Design' of the Southwark Plan (Modifications Version) and Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Adopted Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995.

- 9 An almost identical planning application (reference number 06-AP-2070) to application 07-AP-0769, was refused in February 2007 for the erection of a two storey building comprising 2 x 2 bedroom self contained units.

The two reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. The proposed residential development by reason of the narrow frontage and 4 metre setback between two 2-storey buildings would result in poor quality accommodation to the future occupiers in respect of outlook and light to the main bedrooms of both units and the kitchen of the unit adjoining no 68 Crawthrew Grove. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' and Policy 4.2 'Quality of Residential Accommodation' of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan (Jan. 2007) and Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' and H.1.8 'Standards for New Housing' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan adopted July 1995 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 1997 No.5: Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development.
2. The proposed building by reason of its roof form and detailed front elevation would be out of character within the terrace resulting in a visually intrusive impact upon the streetscene and upon neighbouring properties contrary to Policy 3.11 'Quality in Design' of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan (Jan. 2007) and Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Adopted Southwark Unitary Development Plan.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 10 No. 70 Crawthrew Grove:
06-AP-1189: In October 2006 planning permission was granted for a change of use of the ground floor A1 (shop) to residential to provide a 2-bedroom self contained flat including the erection of a single storey rear extension and alteration of existing first floor 1 bed flat to include the erection of a rear dormer roof extension with Juliette balcony providing a second bedroom and creation of a first floor roof terrace and other external alterations.
- 11 Enforcement:
Planning enforcement investigated the unauthorised development relating to a rear balcony at 70 Crawthrew Grove and subsequently closed the case (06-EN-0353) when the breach was regularised by retrospective planning permission 06-AP-1189 - see above.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 12 **Summary of main issues**

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 impact on amenity of neighbouring properties.
- c] the impact on the character and appearance of the immediate vicinity.
- d] the impact on highway and pedestrian safety issues.

Planning policy

13 Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

1.4: Employment Sites Outside the Preferred Office Locations and Preferred Industrial Locations

3.2: Protection of Amenity

3.11: Efficient use of land

3.12: Quality in design

3.13: Urban Design

3.14: Designing out crime

4.1: Density of residential development

4.2: Quality of residential accommodation

5.3: Walking and cycling

5.6: Car parking

14 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Residential Design Standards September 2008

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

PPG 13 Transport

Principle of development

16 The site is currently used for the storage of car parts and the change of use of the premises from storage (Use Class B8) to residential use is acceptable in land use terms. The existing storage facility is the only such use in an area that is predominantly residential characterised by two storey terraced housing and in this case the loss of employment floorspace is acceptable as it meets criteria i - iv of Policy 1.4.

17 Policy 1.4 of The Southwark Plan permits changes of use from B class to suitable mixed or residential uses provided the following criteria is met;
i) The site does not have direct access on to a classified road; or
ii) The site is not within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone; or
iii) The site is not within the Central Activities Zone or
iv) The site is not within a Strategic Cultural Area

18 The proposal complies with all of the above and no objection is raised to the proposed residential use. It is noted that the principle of the loss of Use Class B8 was acceptable in the assessment of the previous applications.

19 Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal overcomes the first reason for refusal, relating to mass, bulk and detailed design, of application 08-AP-1833.

Environmental impact assessment

20 Not required for a scheme of this scale.

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

21 The current application has been reduced in height and bulk by the omission of the second storey. The proposed first floor would, apart from the rear bay window, be in line with the rear wall of the neighbouring property at No. 68. This window is to a

bedroom and would be set well back from the rear boundary therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. It is considered that the proposal would not lead to a loss of privacy through overlooking of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, it is considered that the relationship between the rear bay and the windows to the side elevation / outrigger at No. 68 would only afford oblique, if any, views towards No. 68, which would not substantiate a reason for refusal on amenity grounds.

Future occupiers:

- 22 The open plan living area on the ground floor would measure 57 sqm and would comprise a kitchen, breakfast bar, family dining and entertaining as well as a living area. An obscure glazed roof light would be located centrally to this room (which has a flat roof for most part) and would provide adequate light and ventilation.
- 23 The two bedrooms on the first floor and the family bathroom would be generous and well in excess of the minimum room sizes required for a dwelling of this size. In addition to the aforementioned, the proposal would be in compliance with the Lifetime Homes Standards.
- 24 The area of the proposed garden is 69 sqm. The rear and side elevations of the ground floor would have double aspect views into the garden, which can be accessed via level floor entry glazed sliding doors. It is considered that the proposed garden would provide acceptable amenity to future occupiers. As the third reason for refusal of the previous application (08-AP-1833) relates to the quality of the upper maisonette being compromised in the absence of any external private space, this reason for refusal is addressed by the omission of a second flat. It should be noted that the size of the garden provided for the unit on lower levels has increased by 16sqm (area previously 53sqm) as the depth of the single storey element has been reduced by 1m. The lobby area provides storage space and the open area under the stairs can be used for the storage of cycles and prams. The proposal therefore meets the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Residential Design Standards September 2008.
- 25

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

- 26 The properties in the immediate vicinity are all in residential use and would have no detrimental impact on the proposed residential unit.

Traffic issues

- 27 The lack of cycle storage, cited as the third reason for refusal of application 08-AP-1833, has been resolved by a combination of reducing the number of units and the provision of an open cycle storage area beneath the stairs on the ground floor.
- 28 The refuse and recycling area to the front entrance area is adequate to cater for the needs of the proposed dwelling.
- 29 The Transport Team have no objections to the above application as it is considered that there will be no significant negative impact on the performance and safety of the surrounding highway network.

Design issues

- 30 In December 2008 the Dulwich Community Council refused an application for the erection of a new three storey building incorporating two self contained flats for three

reasons, of which reason 1 relates to design, as follows:

- 31 *The roof form of the proposed new building by reason of its mass, bulk and detailed design, would fail to respond positively to its surroundings, its inappropriate scale and design particularly when viewed straight on would appear incongruous within the street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of amenity, 3.11 Efficient use of land, 3.12 Quality in design and 3.13 Urban design of the Southwark Plan 2007.*
- 32 The surrounding late Victorian residential terraces are two storeys with pitched roofs and most do not have accommodation in the roof. The terrace to the south east of the application site ends with No. 68, which has a hip-end roof. No. 70, directly to the west, has a gabled roof and No. 72 and properties onwards have parapet walls and inverted valley roofs.
- 33 It is considered that this design solution, incorporating a flat roof, resolves party wall and maintenance issues raised by No. 68 under the previous application.
- Facade:
- 34 The facade of the proposed building would be set back from the facade of 70 Crawthorpe Grove.
- 35 The design of the refuse and recycling area to the front entrance area would blend in and be an appropriate addition to the street scene. This is quite a unique corner site and the proposed front elevation is appropriate in the context.
- 36 A high quality of design and materials will be required for the street environment and this proposal complies as it proposes the use of render at ground floor level and hardwood timber cladding at first floor level which respect the character and appearance of the streetscene and the adjoining Victorian terraces. As such, the proposed work comply with policy 3.13 by reason of the proposed development is considered acceptable because of its scale, and materials which is generally considered to be sympathetic when considered in the context of the proposed dwelling and adjoining properties.
- 37 It is considered that the design and materials of the proposal will appear congruous within this context of the streetscene in terms of proportion, height, and materials and the scheme is acceptable in design terms.
- 38 There is no objection to the proposed rear brick boundary wall which would replace the existing wall. At a height of 2m it would be the same height as the existing wall and would be finished in white smooth render. It is also considered that the introduction of a green roof to the roof of the single storey rear addition would be an aesthetically pleasing feature.

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

- 39 The site is not located within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.

Impact on trees

- 40 There are no trees on the site or in close proximity that would be affected by the proposal.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 41 None required for a scheme of this limited scale.

Sustainable development implications

Water run-off:

- 42 The use of a permeable paving surface to the rear garden and front entrance area and a green roof to the single storey rear addition is welcomed as it would reduce the risk of localised flooding.
- 43 The use of a night time activated low energy lighting above the front entrance door is welcomed.
- 44 Condition 11 relates to composting of organic waste and the collection of rainwater for recycling and it is considered that such a condition would ensure that the future occupiers would have the necessary facilities available to enable them to recycle and reduce household waste and water consumption.

Other matters

Access:

- 45 Level floor entry is provided through the front entrance door and the ground floor is designed to provide wheelchair access throughout, including the ground floor WC.

Landscaping:

- 46 The applicant advised that landscape design could be formulated subject to an appropriate condition. Landscaping on the site would be limited, but it is considered that this could be covered by an appropriate condition. It is noted that the single storey element to the rear elevation would have a green roof.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 47 The proposed scheme is successful in addressing and overcoming the previous reasons for refusal, mainly due to the omission of a second floor and the incorporation of a flat roof and a facade which blends well into the streetscene.

Community impact statement

- 48 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 following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as: none.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above. Specific actions to ameliorate these implications are: none

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

51 Transport has no objection.

52 Access officer has no objection.

Human rights implications

53 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.

54 This application has the legitimate aim of providing new 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

55 **Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance**

N/a

56 **REASONS FOR LATENESS**

N/a

57 **REASONS FOR URGENCY**

N/a

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2621-68A Application file: 10-AP-1738 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone:: 020 7525 5457 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	Andre Verster	
Version	Final	
Dated	27 September 2010	
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 Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Date final report sent to Community Council Team		

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 30/06/2010

Press notice date: Not required.

Case officer site visit date: Conducted a site visit in 2009 during the assessment of the previously refused application (Dulwich Community Council overturned recommendation) and the agent advised that the situation / immediate vicinity has not changes since. A visit to the site on in June 2010 by the case officer to post the site notice confirmed this.

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 2 July 2010 and 8 September 2010

Internal services consulted: 29 June 2010

Access
Conservation and Design
Transport

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

None

Neighbours consulted:

12 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
14 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
10 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
7 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
9 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
9A SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
60 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
62B CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
10B SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
11B SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
12A SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
68 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
74 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
78 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
37 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AD
41 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AD
13A SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
8A SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
8B SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
FLAT B 8 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
6A WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
6B WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FLAT A 5 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FLAT A 15 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 3 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
GROUND FLOOR REAR 3 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
72C CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
72D CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
80 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
66 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
11 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
13 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
16 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
62A CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
10A SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
11A SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
12B SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
13B SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
2 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD

64 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
72 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
76 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
39 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AD
43 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AD
9B SPURLING ROAD LONDON SE22 9AE
72E CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
GROUND FLOOR FRONT 3 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 70 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 70 CRAWTHEW GROVE
LONDON SE22 9AB
FLAT A 8 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FLAT B 15 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FLAT B 5 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FLAT C 5 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
6C WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 72 CRAWTHEW GROVE LONDON SE22 9AB
SECOND FLOOR FLAT 3 WORLINGHAM ROAD LONDON SE22 9HD
25 Kingsthorpe Road London SE26 4PG
11 Bassano Street East Dulwich London SE22 8RU

Local groups consulted: 2 July 2010

The Dulwich Society
The East Dulwich Society

Re-consultation:

The following revisions were received and neighbours re-consulted for 14 days on 8 September 2010:

Reduction in floor area of the proposed rear single storey extension by approx 1m in both north and eastward directions. Increase of rear garden from 53 square metres to 69 square metres.

Provision of 'Green roof' to flat roof area above the proposed single storey extension.

The arrow on the rear flat roof has been rotated 180 degrees to show the rainwater falling towards the rear / north.

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Conservation and Design:

No objection.

Access:

Living accommodation is on the ground floor which leads directly on to the rear garden.

Ground floor and garden space complies with the requirements of the SPD and Part M in regards to disabled access.

Level access provided to the property. Accessing the property and using the ground floor space is acceptable and complies with policy.

No facilities are provided like a stair lift to gain access to the first floor; however the space at first floor level is acceptable.

As such, there are no objections in regards to disabled access. This is a single residential dwelling and as a result of site constraints the proposal is acceptable and recommended for approval.

Transport:

There is no proposed vehicle access associated with the existing site or the proposed development.

The proposed development has step-free disabled access at ground level.

There are no concerns over access at the development.

Policy 5.3 (Cycle Storage)

Room for bicycle storage has been provided on-site and is adequate for the expected demand.

Policy 5.6 (Car Parking)

No off street car parking has been provided in association with the proposed development. The proposal is for a two-bedroom dwelling and as such will be unlikely to add significantly to on-street parking stress.

Transport have no objections to the above application, as there will be no significant negative impact on the performance and safety of the surrounding highway network.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

Neighbours and local groups

Five letters of objection have been received from 68 and 70a Crawthorpe Grove and 9,

10 and 11 Worlingham Road. However, the objection from 70a Crawthow Grove has been withdrawn.

9 Worlingham Grove:

Huge negative impact and loss of amenity - noise disturbance, overlooking; not in keeping with other houses/buildings in the street. The ground floor development will be 10 feet from our back boundary. The proposal has glass doors and numerous full length windows (6) and patio doors which open out only feet from the boundry fence. The amount of windows (all full length) at the rear of the property will mean we and other properties in Worlingham road will be seriously overlooked. I am also concerned at the amount of noise that will be generated so close to a child's bedroom. Part of the boundry wall (BRICK) joining 68A and 9 Worlingham road is at least 12 feet high and has been like this for a large number of years. Other parts of this wall are 10 feet high and all along this wall is a large amount of plants some of which are very mature and over 20 years old. I am not happy that I will be worse off as a result of a 6 foot replacement and loss of plants. Who actually owns this wall and can I be made worse off as a result?

Officer comment:

Drawing 14 E indicates that a replacement brick built boundary wall would be built and that at 2m high it would be the same height as the existing wall. The rear wall of the single storey rear element is in line with the rear walls of the terrace to the east and although the garden is marginally smaller would follow the pattern of development in the vicinity of the site. It is considered that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Fails to preserve or enhance the character of Southwark through excellence in design and protection or enhancement of the historic environment. Crawthow and Worlingham Roads are full of Victorian houses none of which have flat roofs like the one proposed at the rear of the property.

Fails to enhance the quality of the built environment with quality design or architecture.

Is in breach of Southwark Plan Policy 3.13 (principles of good urban design) which includes: height, scale and massing; density of layout in relation to urban space and movement; townscape, local context and character; site layout; streetscape; landscaping; creating a pleasant environment which people will take pride in.

SP Policy 3.15 conserving the built heritage as a community asset is the aim, not to have an adverse effect on it.

SP Policy 3.22 impacts negatively on an important local view, panorama, or prospect and its setting.

Officer comment:

The above issues have been taken into account in the assessment of the proposal and discussed in paragraphs 30 to 37 of the report.

The plans submitted are not accurate. For example Photos 19 and 20 purport to be taken from 9 and 10 Worlingham road which are directly behind the 68A. These photos have been taken from no. 7 Worlingham road, which was for sale and not directly behind the proposed new build. Can you verify these photos?

Officer comment:

It appears that these photos are taken from No. 7.

10 Worlingham Grove:

Over development: the site is surrounded on all sides by homes and small gardens. This development is serious over-development and would essentially result in a house being 'crammed' into an inappropriate space. It would seriously compromise the neighbouring homes.

Poor quality housing would be provided.

Officer comment:

The current application overcomes the previous reasons for refusal and provides good quality of accommodation.

The proposed development would overlook my home and garden, compromising the privacy of my family.

Officer comment:

Please see response to No. 9 above.

The proposed development would block masses of light to my home and garden. This would have significant negative impact on the enjoyment of my home and garden.

Officer comment:

The two storey element would be in-line with the existing adjacent properties and would not, although infilling an existing gap, lead to unacceptable shadow leading to a loss of light to the detriment of houses to the north east along Worlingham Road.

There is already very limited parking on all the neighbouring streets and a further residential development would exacerbate the issue.

Officer comment:

Given that the proposed house would comprise only two bedrooms it is considered that it is unlikely that it would add significantly to on-street parking stress.

11 Worlingham Road:

The design of the building is completely out of keeping with the Victorian terraces surrounding it.

This is already a densely populated area and cannot take any more building.

The garden area of the proposed building will be so small that the house will be far too close to the back of our property. This will impact greatly on our privacy and noise levels will be high.

The back windows of the second storey of the property will be too close, overlook us and destroy our privacy completely.

The proposed balcony will do the same.

The height of the proposed property will have an impact on daylight into our house and garden.

In my opinion the land area is far too small for a development such as this.

Officer comment:

No new issues raised.

68 Crawthrew Grove:

As the previous applications for this site, we object to this proposal. There are factual inaccuracies within the application that purport to show this proposal in a positive light i.e. the photographs included are not from the points indicated on the map and if anything, show clearly the small, obscure and inappropriate space that this is for a dwelling. The Design & Access statement appears to be based on assumptions and by no way incorporates the facts or thoughts of the affected local community. It does not comply with the Southwark UDP or the Dulwich Plan, to be addressed later.

Officer comment:

The site officer conducted a site visit and is of the opinion that although some of the arrows and photographs on 'photo sheet 1' do not correspond a well informed recommendation has been made, based on knowledge of the site and surroundings.

The application for this site has previously been refused at a detailed and long Community Council meeting in 2008. The concerns remain about overcrowding, overlooking, unsuitable and incongruous design (unfit for a street of Victorian terraces), poor quality housing provision, parking and the treatment of the waste for 70 & 70a (a property also developed by the same developer).

Officer comment:

These issues have been assessed and discussed in the relevant sections of the report.

This proposal is;

- Contrary to Policy 3.11 'Quality in Design' of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan and Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Adopted Southwark Unitary Development Plan due to the front elevation that would be out of character within the terrace resulting in a visually intrusive impact upon the street scene and upon neighbouring properties. The boxed window at the rear is an thinly veiled attempt to increase the size of a very small bedroom – the visual impact being on the neighbours. The box window also raises issues for overlooking into our kitchen bay window and creating shadow.

Officer comment:

These issues have been assessed in the report and the proposed rear bay window in particular.

- Inappropriate in its scale and design particularly when viewed straight on would appear incongruous within the street scene. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of amenity, 3.11 Efficient use of land, 3.12 Quality in design and 3.13 Urban design of the Southwark Plan 2007

- Failing to respond positively to its surroundings; it's inappropriate scale and design by reason of its mass, bulk and detailed design does not provide any positive impact to the neighbours (blocks light, space and overlooks existing neighbours).

Officer comment:

Given the reduced scale of the proposed building it is considered that the proposal would not lead to a loss of light or feeling of enclosure to neighbouring properties.

- The quality of both the indoor and outdoor space, proximity to the existing neighbours and over-developed nature of the space is contrary to Policies 3.11 Efficient use of land and 4.2 Quality of Accommodation of the Southwark Plan 2007

and the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2008)

- Providing poor quality accommodation to the future occupiers in respect of outlook and light – as well as severely impeding the existing neighbours by overlooking and loss of privacy and therefore contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' and Policy 4.2 'Quality of Residential Accommodation' of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan (Jan. 2007) and Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' and H.1.8 'Standards for New Housing' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan adopted July 1995 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 1997 No.5: Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development.

- 2.8 House and flat developments should be arranged to safeguard the amenity and privacy of occupiers and neighbours. New development, extensions, alterations and conversions should not subject neighbours to unacceptable noise disturbance, overlooking or loss of security. To prevent unnecessary problems of overlooking, loss of privacy and disturbance, development should achieve the following distances:

. A minimum distance of 12 metres at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts on to a highway

. A minimum distance of 21 metres at the rear of the building.

Officer comments:

The above figures are guidance only and can be applied to a degree of flexibility as each application is assessed on its own merits. In this case the facade is in line with the adjoining terrace and is acceptable. The first floor rear bay window is slightly more than 9.5m from the rear boundary and projects almost 1m further back than the windows to the rear elevation of the terrace that the application site would form part of. The rear gardens of properties to the north east along Worlingham Road are between 10m and 12m deep. The first floor rear elevation would therefore be marginally less than 21m from the rear elevations of the properties to the north east. This relationship is however considered acceptable in this instance as the proposal would not give rise to undue amenity impacts detrimental to neighbours. The ground floor projects further back than the rear additions / outriggers of adjoining properties, but in this instance it is considered acceptable as it would not lead to any loss of outlook or light and feeling of enclosure.

The summary from the Design and Access statement is factually incorrect and is entirely subjective and we disagree with the statements made by the developers agent. Given that they do not live in the immediate area the comments are subjective and speculative.

Officer comment: None.

Please find a list of the policies and guidance from Southwark which impact this proposal as supporting information attached.

In summary, our concerns are as follows;

- 1) Over development and inappropriate design of the site at 68a Crawthwe Grove
- 2) The imposition and loss of privacy to the existing property and neighbours of the new proposal (noise of adjoining rooms to both 68 and 70 / 70a as well as to the rear with opening doors from an open plan living space / opening doors)
- 3) Inappropriate development based on the current housing stock – the materials and style will date quickly
- 4) Not in keeping with the street (Victorian properties) and of a style of design that is already out of vogue
- 5) The abutting nature of the proposals to the current properties – roof and third party wall issues have not been discussed with the affected neighbours
- 6) Our and neighbouring properties privacy is unacceptably affected

- 7) Parking spaces not being provided in an already busy street
- 8) Concerns for the main sewer residing in 68a which would be built over – the water table and disturbance of it at the bottom of a valley shaped topography is concerning for all neighbouring properties
- 9) Treatment of the existing waste bin problem at 70/70a which reside outside 68a currently
- 10) In-fill / backland nature of the development
- 11) The comments about providing a positive contribution to the area are at most speculative

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

As used as part of the Neighbour Consultation at the Community Council, this document shows the actual site – the photographs submitted in the new application, we believe, have been mis-referenced. Please see specific neighbours concern on this matter.

Officer comment: Not presented in an openable format - could not be printed. .

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Please note the non compliance to the following Southwark Policies:

- Not be of a size or scale that would visually dominate neighbouring properties (SDP)
- Not unacceptably affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight (SDP)
- 3.8 Backland development. Back land development is the development of new houses or garages in back gardens. Back land development can have a significant impact on amenity, neighbouring properties and the character of the area. Dulwich is not a suitable area for back land development due to the character of the area. Dulwich is characterised by being leafy, open and green, with mainly low-rise suburban buildings. Building new dwellings or gardens in back gardens would alter the character of Dulwich and harm the existing unique character of the area (Dulwich Plan)

3.8 Infill development

Infill development occurs where there is redevelopment of sites located between existing property frontages, and where any new buildings should normally continue the lines of existing development to each side. The proposal needs to show how the proposed housing responds to the site and its surroundings. The building alignment, design and massing needs to be within the context of existing neighbouring properties. The height and scale of neighbouring properties must also be respected. (SDP)

3.9 Backland development

Backland developments sites are those located predominately to the rear of existing dwellings. Development on such sites includes garden buildings such as sheds and greenhouses, and new residential units (also refer to section 3.6 above). Backland development predominately occurs in the gardens of the surrounding houses but can also occur in garage courts and between two streets.

Backland development, particularly for new residential units, can have a significant impact on amenity, neighbouring properties and the character of an area. To minimise

impact on the surrounding area and neighbouring amenity, proposals for backland development need to consider the following

- Development must not be more intensive than the existing development on the existing street frontage. Frequently backland development is single storey development so as not to impose on the surrounding area. Backland development should echo the characteristics of existing development
- Degree of overlooking to neighbouring gardens
- Spacing between facing windows of habitable rooms. There should be no windows on the boundary between the backland development and existing properties to protect neighbour's privacy.
- As far as possible the orientation of backland development should relate to that of the existing surrounding buildings. i.e. dwelling backs facing dwelling backs and fronts facing fronts.

Windows should look into the proposal site, rather than outwards where possible.

- Possible noise nuisance
 - Possible vehicular fumes
 - Impact on natural habitat including trees, vegetation and wildlife
 - Backland development must integrate with existing landscape features.
 - Access to the new backland development including vehicular, pedestrian and cyclists. It must be of adequate width of allow vehicular access to the development site as appropriate. This includes access for servicing and emergency services.
 - There must be space within the backland development for refuse storage and access for collection of the refuse
 - Maximising security and surveillance through design.
- Make a positive contribution to local context, character and communities, including contributing to the streetscape. (SDP)
 - New development should not cause excessive overshadowing of existing communal amenity spaces or neighbouring properties (SDP)
 - 2.7 Residential developments should maximise sunlight and daylight, both within the new development and to neighbouring properties. Development should seek to minimise overshadowing or blocking of light to adjoining properties. A lack of daylight can have negative impacts on health as well as making the development gloomy and uninviting. (SDP)
 - New development should not cause excessive overshadowing of existing communal amenity spaces or neighbouring properties. (SDP)
 - 2.8 House and flat developments should be arranged to safeguard the amenity and privacy of occupiers and neighbours. New development, extensions, alterations and conversions should not subject neighbours to unacceptable noise disturbance, overlooking or loss of security. To prevent unnecessary problems of overlooking, loss of privacy and disturbance, development should achieve the following distances:
 - . A minimum distance of 12 metres at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts on to a highway
 - . A minimum distance of 21 metres at the rear of the building

- Roof extensions will not be permitted in the following circumstances:

- Where additional floors in any form would harm the architectural integrity of a building or the unity of a group.
- Where roof extensions cut through ridge or hip lines.
- On buildings which are the same height or significantly higher than their neighbours, especially those which have been extended in the past.
- On buildings and in terraces which are completed compositions or which have existing mansards or roof storeys.
- Where the varied skyline of a terrace or group of buildings is of interest and should be maintained.
- Where the building has roofline features which were designed to be seen against the sky.
- Where it would unbalance the proportions of the building.
- Where there is an unbroken run of butterfly roofs.
- Where the roofline is exposed to long views from public spaces and a roof extension in any form would have a detrimental impact on that view.
- Where important historic roof forms would be lost.
- No roof extensions above the height of the ridge of the main roof.

(NOTE – whilst the proposal is not an extension, the proposal appears to flout these basic principles of roof scape)

- New development will not make parking and traffic congestion in the area worse (Dulwich Plan)

SPECIFIC POLICY THAT THE PROPOSAL BREACHES

Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity

The policy sets out that planning permission will not be granted where it will cause a loss of amenity including disturbance from noise.

Policy 3.11 Efficient Use of Land

The policy sets out how developments should ensure that they maximise the efficient use of land whilst also protecting a number of other factors including amenity and design.

Policy 3.12 Quality in Design

The policy sets out that developments should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design in order to create attractive, high amenity environments. It also states that a Design Statement must be submitted with planning applications.

Policy 3.13 Urban Design

The policy sets out the principles of good design to include height of buildings, site layout and inclusive design.

Policy 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation

The policy sets out the requirements for residential developments as:

i. achieve good quality living conditions; and

ii. include high standards of:

- Accessibility, including seeking to ensure that all new housing is built to Lifetime Homes

standards;

- Privacy and outlook;

- Natural daylight and sunlight;

- Ventilation;

- Space, including suitable outdoor/green space;

- Safety and security; and

- Protection from pollution, including noise and light pollution.

Re-consultation responses:

Four letters of objection have been received from 9, 10 and 11 Worlingham Road and 68 Crawthorpe Grove raising the following concerns:

The development is still too close and too high and will impose impact on the amount of light into the house and garden of No. 11.

Despite the amendments the proposal will mean No. 11 will be directly overlooked and their privacy will be seriously compromised.

The design is also inappropriate for the area.

Huge negative impact and loss of amenity- noise disturbance, overlooking; not in keeping with other houses/buildings in the street;

Fails to preserve or enhance the character of Southwark through excellence in design and protection or enhancement of the historic environment;

Fails to enhance the quality of the built environment with quality design or architecture;

Is in breach of Southwark Plan Policy 3.13 (principles of good urban design) which includes: height, scale and massing; density of layout in relation to urban space and movement; townscape, local context and character; site layout; streetscape; landscaping; creating a pleasant environment which people will take pride in;

SP Policy 3.15 conserving the built heritage as a community asset is the aim, not to

have an adverse effect on it;

SP Policy 3.22 impacts negatively on an important local view, panorama, or prospect and its setting.

The development would provide poor quality housing.

There is already verly limited parking on all the neighbouring streets and a further residential development would exacerbate the issue.

Over-development: the site is surrounded on all sides by homes and small gardens. This development would essentially result in a house being crammed into an inappropriate space and would seriously compromise the neighbouring homes.

The photos used in the application purport to be taken from No. 10 Worlingham Road. The occupiers of No. 10 advised that they were not taken from their home but from the rear window of a home several doors away. It is requested that the photos submitted by the developer are accurat.

