

Item No. 6.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 23 November 2011	Meeting Name: WALWORTH COMMUNITY COUNCIL
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-1738 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 55 COBOURG ROAD, LONDON, SE5 0HU Proposal: Erection of a 4 storey side extension and provision of hard landscaping and new boundary wall and railings to front of dwelling (Use Class C3).		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	East Walworth		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 27 May 2011		Application Expiry Date 22 July 2011	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Refuse planning permission.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 This application is referred to Walworth Community Council for determination following a request from the Chair (Councillor Seaton, East Walworth ward) and Vice Chair (Councillor Merrill, East Walworth ward).

Site location and description

- 3 The application premises comprises a three storey plus basement end of terrace dwelling with a raised ground floor, located to the northern end of Cobourg Road in a predominantly residential area. Directly opposite the site is Burgess Park.
- 4 The application property is Grade II listed and is located in the Cobourg Road Conservation Area.

Details of proposal

- 5 The proposal under consideration is for the erection of a 4 storey side extension, re-landscaping to the front of the dwelling, and provision of a new boundary wall and railings to the front.
- 6 The proposed extension would be finished in matching secondhand stock bricks in a Flemish bond.
- 7 The boundary treatment to the front will comprise a low rise brick wall with brick pillars at either end, and wrought iron railings and a gate to match 49 and 51 Cobourg Road.
- 8 The front forecourt of the property will be finished with York stone slabs, water binding limestone gravel and flower beds.
- 9 The differences between the application under consideration and a previously refused scheme on the site are as follows:

- Change of the facing materials from glazed mathematical tiles to reclaimed stock brick;
- Complete reinstatement of walls, pillars and railings to the front of the site and removal of an off-street parking space;
- Re-design of the windows in the rear elevation of the proposed extension;
- A reduction in the depth of the extension by 0.25m to (5.75m).

The four storey extension to the side would be identical in shape and form to that of the refused scheme (10-AP-3695).

Planning history

- 10 Listed Building consent was granted on 30 January 1997 by the Government Office for London for demolition and rebuilding of the brick wall across the passageway, external to the building and leading to the rear garden, and repair to the flank wall brickwork to the main house at no. 55 Cobourg Road (reference: 9700476).
- 11 10-AP-3695
 Planning permission was refused on 14/02/2011 for erection of a 4 storey side extension providing additional residential accommodation and erection of new boundary wall and railings to front of dwelling.

The application was refused for the following reason;

The proposed extension, owing to its excessive size, location and the use of inappropriate materials would dominate the host building, would harm the symmetry of the listed terrace, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the Cobourg Road Conservation Area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.12 'Quality in Design', 3.13 'Urban Design', 3.15 'Conservation of the historic environment', 3.16 'Conservation areas' and 3.18 'Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites' of the Southwark Plan 2007, policy 4B.12 'Heritage conservation' of the London Plan (Consolidated with alterations since 2004) and PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'.

- 12 10-AP-3696
 Listed Building Consent was refused on 14/02/2011 for erection of a 4 storey side extension providing additional residential accommodation and erection of new boundary wall and railings to front of dwelling.

The application was refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension, owing to its excessive size, location and the use of inappropriate materials would dominate the host building and would harm the symmetry of the listed terrace. As such it is considered that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic and architectural interest of the listed building and the listed terrace of which it forms a part, contrary to policies 3.15 'Conservation and the Historic Environment', 3.17 'Listed Buildings' and 3.18 'Setting of Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and World Heritage Sites' of the Southwark Plan (July) 2007, policy 4B.12 'Heritage conservation' of the London Plan (Consolidated with alterations since 2004) and PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 13 9901998
 51 Cobourg Road - Listed building consent granted 15 February 2000 for demolition and rebuilding of rear steps on new foundations.
- 14 03-AP-1790 and 1591
 47 Cobourg Road - Planning permission and Listed Building consent were refused on 12 November 2003 for the erection of a single storey conservatory extension for the

following reason:

The proposed extension by virtue of its size in relation to the existing rear extension, poor design and poor quality materials would adversely impact on the special architectural or historic interest of the building as well as the character of the Conservation Area and would be contrary to Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' and E.4.3 'Design in Conservation Areas' of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan, Policies 3.1 'Environmental Effects', 3.6 'Heritage Conservation' and 3.14 'Quality in Design' of the Draft Southwark Plan and guidance contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 'Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development'.

- 15 09-AP-1757 - Demolish and rebuild damaged front and side garden wall and pillar in matching London stock-brick. Add black-painted cast-iron railings to front and side walls to match height and style of existing railings on boundaries of neighbouring house. Installation of 6ft high wrought iron gate. Replace modern concrete slab front door steps with reclaimed York stone.

Listed building consent was refused in November 2009 for the following reason:

The proposal design will not preserve the listed building and its features of special architectural or historic interest, as the design has failed to reference historically appropriate styles and scales for front-boundary walls and railings. We also consider that the proposal will fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, as the proposal design will not relate to the design, form and scale of the adjacent building's wall and railings, thereby failing to achieve a sense of consistency for the streetscape. The proposal is not in accordance with Policies: 3.12 Quality in Design; 3.16 Conservation Areas; 3.17 Listed Buildings; of The Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.

- 16 An appeal was subsequently lodged and was dismissed, the Inspector concluding that the proposed boundary treatment would fail to preserve the special historic and architectural interest of the listed building (reference: APP/A5840/E/10/2128848).

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) the impact on the appearance of the building
- b) the impact on the character and appearance of the Cobourg Road Conservation area
- c) the impact on the character and setting of the Listed building.
- d) the impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 12 - Design and Conservation

Strategic Policy 13 - High Environmental Standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

Policy 3.2 - Protection of Amenity

Policy 3.12 - Quality in Design

Policy 3.13 - Urban Design

Policy 3.15 - Conservation and the Historic Environment

Policy 3.16 - Conservation Areas
Policy 3.17 - Listed Buildings
Policy 3.18 - Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites

Residential Design Standards SPD (2011).

London Plan 2011

Policy 7.4 - Local character
Policy 7.6 - Architecture
Policy 7.8 - Heritage assets and archaeology

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

PPS5 - Planning for the Historic Environment

Principle of development

- 17 The erection of an extension to a dwelling and provision of new landscaping and boundary treatment to the front does not raise any landuse issues.

Environmental impact assessment

- 18 An Environmental Impact Assessment is not required as part of this planning application.

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

- 19 The proposed extension would not result in any loss of residential amenity in so far as light infringement, loss of privacy or loss of outlook is concerned as it would face onto the flank wall of the adjoining property at no. 57 Cobourg Road. The windows to the rear of the extension would face down the rear garden as per the existing rear windows and would not result in any loss of privacy, and no adverse impacts would arise as a result of the proposed boundary treatment and landscaping works.

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

- 20 None envisaged

Traffic issues

- 21 The proposal would result in the loss of an off-street parking space at the front of the property. However, as the existing crossover would then become redundant, it would be possible to park on the street in front of the property, subject to on-street parking restrictions. As such, no objections are raised on transport grounds.

Design issues

- 22 No.55 is a grade II listed building within the Cobourg Road Conservation Area, and is central to a group of 9 listed houses (No.s 47-63 odds) which are grouped together in a linked terrace, all of which date to 1800-25. The significance of this group, when assessed under Policy HE7.2 of PPS5, is their general consistency of form and scale, although there is a surprising amount of variety (for a group of Georgian houses) in their detailed design. The significance is also their value as a rare survivor for a group of this age in this area, as indicative of early C19 development in the countryside around central London.
- 23 No.55 is read as forming a mini-group within this terrace, which along with No.49 encloses the semi-detached houses at No.s 51+53, to which 49 and 55 are linked with

a set-back section. No.s 49 + 55 then have an open gap to the listed buildings on either side (No.s 47 and 57) which defines the identity and symmetry of this mini-group.

- 24 This proposal entails a four-storey side extension to the southern flank of No.55, which would effectively close this gap, and break the symmetry of this group. Officers consider the scale of the proposal to be excessive and insensitive to the heritage value of this building, and its constituent group. The scale of this extension is considered excessive, both physically and aesthetically, as an intervention that has not considered the historic value of this listed building and its essential role in the composition of the wider group. This group of houses face onto Burgess Park, with an openness of aspect that allows greater appreciation of the listed buildings and their inter-relationship.
- 25 In terms of materials, the proposal is for matching secondhand stock bricks in a Flemish bond which would be acceptable, provided a suitable match can be found.
- 26 The rear fenestration is poorly informed however, and while there is a rationale for honesty in a new extension, the scale and form of the proposed windows to the extension are unresponsive to the proportions and detailing of the listed building. This will be particularly evident as there is only a 450mm set-back from the rear elevation, so the new windows will very much be read adjacent to the existing four-over-four/six-over-six sashes, to which the proposed single-pane sashes will appear incongruous.
- 27 It should also be considered that whilst there are no in principle objections in so far as extensions to listed buildings are concerned, they should be clearly subservient to the host building in terms of scale, and sympathetic to it in terms of detailing and materials. The revised scheme is very similar to the previously refused scheme in so far as the four storey side extension is concerned, and it is considered that the proposal has failed to comply with these criteria. Furthermore, the side extension is excessive in scale and disruptive to the proportions and balance of the listed building, as well as its constituent group.
- 28 Whilst this proposal has been revised following a previously refused application, officers consider that the extension would be unacceptable as it would fail to preserve the listed building's features of special architectural or historic interest, as well as its relationship within the wider group of listed buildings (No.s 47-63 odds).
- 29 The boundary treatment proposed to the front will comprise a low rise brick wall with brick pillars at either end with wrought iron railings and a gate to match 49 and 51 Cobourg Road. The front forecourt of the property will be finished in a combination of soft and hard landscaping using a combination of York stone slabs and water binding limestone gravel and flower beds. This is considered acceptable and would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the listed building and the wider conservation area and no objections are raised in this regard.

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

- 30 As stated, the proposal entails a four-storey side extension to the southern flank of No.55, which effectively closes the gap between numbers 55 and 57, and breaks the symmetry of this group. It is considered that the scale of the proposal is excessive and insensitive to the heritage value of this building, and its constituent group. The scale of this extension is considered excessive, both physically and aesthetically, as an intervention that has not considered the historic value of this listed building and its essential role in the composition of the wider group. The proposed extension would therefore be detrimental to the character and setting of the listed building and the listed terrace of which it forms a part, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Cobourg Road Conservation Area.

Impact on trees

31 There are no trees affected by the proposal.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

32 The proposal raises no S106 agreement issues.

Sustainable development implications

33 The proposal raises no sustainable development issues.

Other matters

34 None specific

Conclusion on planning issues

35 In conclusion, an extension to a domestic dwelling to provide additional accommodation raises no objections in principle. However, the size and scale of the extension is considered to be excessive and will result in an incongruous feature that would be harmful to the appearance of the building.

36 The building is listed and forms part of a terrace of listed buildings, and the proposed extension is considered to be insensitive given its size and scale. As such it is considered that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic and architectural interest of the listed building and the wider group of listed buildings, and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Cobourg Road Conservation Area. As such it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

Community impact statement

37 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; no issues

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

40 Summary of consultation responses

Response from The Georgian Group - refer to Appendix 2.

Human rights implications

41 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.

- 42 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a four storey side extension to provide additional living 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

Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance

- 43 None.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2378-55 Application file: 11-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 5428 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	Donald Hanciles, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	03 November 2011	
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	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		11 November 2011

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 17 June 2011

Press notice date: 16 June 2011

Case officer site visit date: 17 June 2011

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 29 June 2011

Internal services consulted:

Conservation and Design

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

The Georgian Group

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

App. Type	Full Planning Permission
------------------	--------------------------

Date Printed	Address
---------------------	----------------

29/06/2011	57 COBOURG ROAD LONDON SE5 0HU
29/06/2011	59 COBOURG ROAD LONDON SE5 0HU
29/06/2011	55 COBOURG ROAD LONDON SE5 0HU
29/06/2011	51 COBOURG ROAD LONDON SE5 0HU
29/06/2011	53 COBOURG ROAD LONDON SE5 0HU

Re-consultation:

Not required

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Conservation and Design - comments incorporated into body of report

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

The Georgian Group

The scheme is a proposal to improve the operation of the house as a single family dwelling; the Group supports this in principle as it is better for the building to continue being used as designed. Obviously, standards of living have changed since the building's construction and it is right to explore various options that enable the house to remain a viable family home. Whilst it would of course be better if no extension were proposed in conservation terms, as it is always better to retain as much of the original building and its form as possible. There are some conservation gains from the proposals, i.e. the restoration of one of the principle rooms to a bedroom and the removal of rear soil pipes.

On balance, whilst the Group cannot support the extension, the proposals have been developed so as to be largely sympathetic to the building and would not, in my opinion, be especially damaging to the significance of the house as a listed building, nor would it, in my opinion, be especially damaging to the significance of the grouping of historic buildings on Cobourg Road. On the latter point, the proposal to restore the front garden to something more in line with the front gardens of the early 19th century is to be commended and would create an improved relationship between the house and its surroundings; certainly it is positive that high quality and appropriate materials are being proposed for these works in the Design and Access Statement. I would not raise any objection regarding either of these proposals with the Local Planning Authority.

I think it is positive that the proposed cornice has been excluded from the application, however we would have no objections if more information to support the proposal could be provided.

Neighbours and local groups

None received.