

<b>Item no.</b> <b>1.3</b>	<b>Classification</b> OPEN	<b>Decision Level</b> DELEGATED	<b>Date</b> 16/06/2009
<b>From</b> HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT		<b>Title of Report</b> DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT	
<b>Proposal</b> (09-AP-0416) Retrospective application for retention of raised ridge height to roofslope and associated rear dormer addition.		<b>Address</b> 17 CHESTERFIELD GROVE, LONDON, SE22 8RP  <b>Ward</b> East Dulwich	
<b>Application Start Date</b> 06/03/2009		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 01/05/2009	

## PURPOSE

- 1 To consider the above application at Community Council as there are six letters in support of the application and the officer is recommending refusal.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 2 Refuse Planning Permission – ***Refer to Enforcement Team to determine whether to pursue further action.***

## BACKGROUND

### 3 Site location and description

The site is located on the north side of Chesterfield Grove, approximately 75m west of the junction with Lordship Lane. The site forms part of a terrace row of two storey dwellings all of a similar style and appearance.

A slight change in levels to the lay of the land requires the alteration of ridge heights as the terrace ascends up the street, this occurs in a defined pattern to every set of houses, is an original feature of the terrace and is a usual practice and appearance to properties of this type.

### 4 Details of proposal

The proposal details a retrospective application for the raising of the ridge height to no.17 Chesterfield Grove, as well as the incorporated rear dormer addition within this.

The ridge height has been raised by 0.5m from no.15 Chesterfield Grove, 0.3m from no.19 Chesterfield Grove. A natural alteration between these ridge heights at no.'s 15 and 17 Chesterfield Grove occurred previously due to the lay of the land, however no.'s 17 and 19 would have originally matched.

A rear dormer has also been incorporated, being L-shaped and measuring 2.4m high, 4.4m wide and 3.5m deep within the main roofslope and 2.95m wide, 2.3m high and 2.85m deep within the rear outrigger projection roofslope.

### 5 Planning history

No planning history.

**6 Planning history of adjoining sites**

Various applications for alterations to properties here – none to raise the ridge of a dwelling.

**FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**7 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 upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
- c] the design of the proposal.

**8 Planning Policy**

Southwark Plan 2007 [July]  
3.2 Protection of Amenity  
3.12 Quality in Design  
3.13 Urban Design

Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Design Standards 2008

**9 Consultations**

Site notice date:  
03-04-2009

Press notice date:  
N/A

Neighbour consultation letters sent:  
27-03-2009

Case officer site visit date:  
03-04-2009

Internal consultees  
N/A

Statutory and non-statutory consultees  
N/A

Neighbour consultees  
15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 Chesterfield Grove

Re-consultation  
N/A

**10 Consultation replies**

Internal consultees

N/A

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

N/A

Neighbour consultees

Six responses in support of the application from 74A Landcroft Road, 17 Ashbourne Grove, 35 Nutfield Road, 11 Stories Mews, 335a Underhill Road and 22 Chesterfield Grove. They make the following comments:

- While the alteration to the roof came as a shock, it would probably be excessive to ask for changes to it now;
- The alteration to the front roof is noticed but the height does not seem to be out of proportion with the height of the roof ridge of other houses on the street;
- Not all the roof slopes are all uniform on Chesterfield Grove or many of the streets in East Dulwich;
- There are several houses on Nutfield Road where the roof line has visibly changed as a result of approved loft conversions whereas the change at 17 Chesterfield Grove is not obviously visible;
- The works have been carried out to a high standard;
- Does not cause harm to neighbours.

One response received in objection to the application from Chesterfield Grove in objection to the proposal making the following comment:

- The alteration is in contradiction the Southwark Plan and Supplementary Planning Document;
- The increased ridge height is aesthetically intrusive on a street of largely uniform roofline;
- The rear dormer is visible form the roadway and is even more obtrusive when viewed from the 1st floor of properties;
- The rear extension unduly affects the privacy and amenity of the adjoining properties, blocking light from the west;
- The massing is not inkeeping with adjoining properties;
- The application cites a number of properties on Chesterfield Grove where roofline has been amended in attic space conversion works, none of those extend beyond the highest part of the existing Party Wall height and therefore do not set a precedence for the scale and raised ridge level of this development;
- Planning application at no.1 Chesterfield Grove was refused;
- Drawings completed prior to completion of works showed an increase in ridge height.

Re-consultation

N/A

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **11 Principle of development**

In principle there is an objection to this application which is contrary to policy 3.12 Quality in Design and related guidance within Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Design Standards 2008.

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

The proposal details the raising of the ridge of this premises above that of both the adjoining properties at no.'s 15 and 19 Chesterfield Grove. This creates an incongruous feature within the streetscene here, completely disproportionate to the adjoining houses and unbalancing the rhythm and flow of the pattern to rooflines

here. The rear dormer proposed in practise amounts to a third storey extension, completely engulfing the roof plane to the rear of the property here. Again this is consider disproportionate to the building and entirely inappropriate to the context of site, it is acknowledged however that the extension work to the roof falls within the criteria of permitted development and subject to the reduction in the ridge height would not require planning permission.

While a number of consultation responses have been received in support of the application, they do not demonstrate that the alteration is acceptable in policy terms and merely state that the works have been completed to a high standard and that the alteration is not visible. It is considered following an officer visit to the site, that the alteration is highly visible from the streetscene, and clearly conflicts with the visual impact of the streetscene here, generated from roofslopes prior to the alteration.

13 **Design issues**

Supplementary Planning Guidance for Residential Design Standards clearly stipulates that extensions should harmonise with the character of the area, respecting the historic pattern and established grain of the surrounding area. The proposal details a roof alteration which is alien to the established appearance of roof planes here. While the applicant contends that there are other properties within the street where there are altered roof planes, this is an original feature of the terrace, with a change in ridge heights as properties ascending the street accommodating the change in levels to the lay of the land. Other alterations in the form of rear dormer extensions have been completed under permitted development rights, which it is likely that the application property would have been able to exercise had they not raised the ridge to the property. What the development has created is an impact in conflict with these existing patterns and rhythms to the streetscape here, raising the ridge in isolation to both adjoining properties.

Furthermore, guidance insists that extensions remain subordinate to the original dwelling, playing a supporting role. It is clear that the raising of the ridge to this property becomes the dominate feature to the house, and therefore cannot reasonably be described as being subordinate.

14 **Other matters**

No other matters identified.

15 **Conclusion**

The proposal is contrary to policies in the Southwark Plan 2007 and guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Design Standards 2008, therefore it is recommended that this application be refused.

16 **COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT**

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 above.

c] The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups

have been also been discussed above.

LEAD OFFICER	Gary Rice	Head of Development Management
REPORT AUTHOR	Rachel Gleave	Planner Officer - Development Control [tel. 020 7525 5597]
CASE FILE	TP/2294-17	
Papers held at:	Regeneration and neighbourhoods dept. tel.: 020 7525 5403 email: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a>	