

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE A	
Report Title	78 HONOR OAK ROAD SE23 3RR	
Ward	Forest Hill	
Contributors	Stephanie Gardiner	
Class	PART 1	04 DECEMBER 2014

Reg. Nos. DC/14/88629

Application dated 04.08.14 [as revised on 29.10.14]

Applicant pH+ on behalf of Mr W Beckett

Proposal Refurbishment and alterations of the existing semi-detached house and two storey side coach house, together with the construction of a single storey ground floor extension to the rear of the existing coach house and construction of an extension in the rear roof slope.

Applicant's Plan Nos. 2(01)00; 2(02)00; 2(03)00; 2(03)-01; 2(03)01; 2(03)02; 2(03)03; 2(03)RF; 2(04)00; 2(04)01; 2(04)02; 2(05)01; 2(05)02; 2(05)03; 2(11)00 Rev A; 2(12)00; 2(12)-01 Rev A; 2(12)02; 2(12)03; 2(12)RF; 2(13)00; 2(13)01 Rev A; 2(13)02; 2(13)04; 2(14)01 Rev A; 2(14)02 Rev B; 2(14)03 Rev B; 2(21)00 Rev A; 2(41)00; 2(42)00; 2(42)01; 2(42)02; 2(42)03; 2(42)04; Supplementary Massing Drawings; Solar Tube Specification Details; Solar Tube Indicative Photo; Design and Access Statement and Structural Survey Report.

Background Papers

- (1) Case File LE/53/78/TP
- (2) Saved Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)
- (3) Local Development Framework Documents
- (4) The London Plan

Designation Area of Stability and Managed Change

## 1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application property is a three-storey plus lower ground floor semi-detached villa, which is located on the north west side of Honor Oak Road, close to the junction with Dartmouth Road. The property benefits from a two-storey coach house attached to the north flank wall and is set back from the principle elevation.
- 1.2 No 78 forms one half of a pair of villas which are locally listed and are described as a '*Pair of villas, c1840. Stock brick, slate and stucco dressings, built to three storeys with basement and of one bay each plus flanking entrance wings with projecting stucco porticos. Ground and basement levels of stucco.*'
- 1.3 The property itself is set back from the road with a large front drive with off-street parking located to the front. To the rear there is an extensive garden, which measures approximately 52m in depth.

- 1.4 There is a change in ground level from north east to north west, with the front of the property being at a lower ground level than the rear of the property. This ground level then increases in height towards the rear of the garden. There have been historical excavations to the rear of the property, with the rear entrance to the coach house being below the ground level of the existing garden.
- 1.5 At the time of the site visit the property was vacant.
- 1.6 The property is located within the Forest Hill Conservation Area which has an Article 4 Direction.

## **2.0 Planning History**

- 2.1 DC/07/66328 – Application for works to a tree in a Conservation Area in order to fell an Apple and Sycamore Tree to the rear of No 78. No objections raised.
- 2.2 DC/07/67731 – Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a single-storey extension to the rear of No 78. Granted.
- 2.3 DC/14/86311 – Application for works to a tree in a Conservation Area to reduce on Ash and one Birth tree by 30%. No objections raised.
- 2.4 DC/14/86409 - Demolition of the existing two storey coach house and the construction of a new extension to the side and rear at 78 Honor Oak Road SE23, together with the construction of an extension in the rear roof slope and installation of a window in the side elevation, internal alterations to create an improved series of integrated spaces at ground and first floor levels, with associated landscaping to the rear garden area. Withdrawn.

## **3.0 Current Planning Applications**

### The Proposals

- 3.1 The current application seeks consent for the construction of single-storey rear extension which would be positioned primarily to the rear of existing coach house. This extension would be partially set below the existing ground level and would have a maximum width of 7m and a depth of 4.8m. It would incorporate a flat roof and would abut the common boundary with No 76 Honor Oak Road The proposed facing materials would include Highcliffe Weathered Buff from All About Bricks and Crittall black metal windows and doors.
- 3.2 The coach house would be primarily retained and refurbished. Alterations would include the removal of the existing wooden doors located to the front of the property and the installation of replacement white timber painted windows, with shutters to the ground floor level. Further alterations to the front would include the installation of white timber sash windows in place of the existing upvc casement windows at the upper floor level. The rear upper wall of the coach house would be reconstructed with Highcliffe Weathered Buff brick and a smooth Portland Bases reconstituted stone for the window surrounds.
- 3.3 An extension would also be made to the existing basement level accommodation to the rear of the main property. This would include a sunken terrace. The basement and sunken terrace would extended 9.1m in depth from the rear wall of the dwelling. Only the sunken terrace portion of the proposal would be visible from the rear garden.

- 3.4 Alterations to the roof include the construction of a small dormer within the rear roof slope. The dormer would measure 1.8m in width and 2m in depth. The proposed facing materials would include Zinc cladding.
- 3.5 A sun tunnel is proposed within the rear roof slope, between two chimney stacks to provide light internally. This would not be visible from ground level.
- 3.6 The application has been revised since submission with the removal of a proposed window within the north east facing elevation of the property. Additional details have been supplied in the form of material samples and window elevations and sections. Massing drawings and ground level details have also been supplied for clarification purposes.

#### Supporting Documents

- 3.7 Drawings: 2(01)00; 2(02)00; 2(11)00 Rev A; 2(12)00; 2(12)-01 Rev A; 2(12)02; 2(12)03; 2(12)RF; 2(13)00; 2(13)01 Rev A; 2(13)02; 2(13)04; 2(14)01; 2(14)02 Rev A; 2(14)03 Rev A; 2(21)00 Rev A; 2(41)00; 2(42)00; 2(42)01; 2(42)02; 2(42)03; 2(42)04; 2(03)00; 2(03)-01; 2(03)01; 2(03)02; 2(03)03; 2(03)RF; 2(04)00; 2(04)01; 2(04)02; 2(05)01; 2(05)02; 2(05)03; Supplementary Massing Drawings; Solar Tube Specification Details and Solar Tube Indicative Photo.
- 3.8 Reports: Design and Access Statement and Survey and Demolition Report.

#### **4.0 Consultation**

- 4.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 4.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to thirty neighbouring residents. Ward Councillors were also consulted.
- 4.3 Three letters of objection have been received from No's 76, 76C and 80 Honor Oak Road. The following objections were raised:
- Concerns about the size and extent of the coach house extension and basement extension. The size of the building work is similar to the size original building
  - The works would harm one of the oldest houses in the Conservation Area
  - The dormer would cause overlooking
  - The dormer would change the architectural character of the property. Neither 78 or 80 have dormers at present.
  - Concerns about trees and mature plants close to the boundary with No 76 and the building works may damage them
  - The proposed bricks are lighter than the existing bricks and this would spoil the look of the property.
  - Noise during construction.
  - The architects have not set out the ground level accurately between the application property and No 76.

- The relationship between the existing coach house and the lower ground floor flat and garden is extremely imposing. The proposed side extension, will sit much higher than the existing fence line, and this will only exasperate the unsatisfactory relationship and further compromise the amenity of the occupants of the garden flat.
- If the Council is minded to approve the application a condition should be imposed preventing the use of the extension as a terrace.
- The basement would be in close proximity to No 80 and there is a risk to an existing garden wall.

4.4 **Conservation Officer:** The relevant test is whether the proposed development preserves or enhances the Locally Listed building and the Conservation Area. In general terms, large extensions to Locally Listed buildings, and in Conservation Areas, are resisted, even where they are not visible, on the grounds of the impact to historic patterns of plot coverage and plan form and the distortion which can occur to the hierarchy of spaces within the building. In this case, the following considerations are influential:

- The proposed development is not visible from the public realm.
- The proposed development is barely visible from neighbouring properties because of its low profile and the nature of local site lines.
- The basement part of the proposed development (to the south) is subterranean. The lower ground floor and upper ground floor elements in the extension are confined to the rear and north side of the plot. This is the site currently occupied by a Coach House extension which appears to date from the mid-1950s and is certainly post war in date. The majority of the above ground proposed development therefore occurs in a non-historic part of the property and consists of a lower ground floor extension of that part and an upper ground floor remodelling of the rear of the Coach House. The proposed lower ground floor extension is significant in size but its impact on the historic property is limited by its low profile, which is partly a result of the differing floor levels to the Coach House. The proposed extension is subsidiary in character to the historic building.
- The proposed development has been amended to reflect the tripartite division of the property, which currently reads as Coach House, rear porch and main volume with bay window and will continue to do so.
- The steep slope of the plot, rising sharply to the west from the street to the back of the garden impacts on the currently existing rear lower ground floor of the existing Coach House and the basement floor of the main building: both make use of light wells and tend to be dark and have limited outlook. It is reasonable for the applicant to seek an enhancement of the amenity of these areas of the property.
- The property has a very large garden. The area of garden impacted by the proposed development is small as a proportion of the garden.

(Letters are available to Members)

4.5 The location, form and massing of the proposed development are therefore considered acceptable in this case.

4.6 Amenities Societies' Panel: No comments

#### Thames Water

4.7 WASTE COMMENTS: Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

4.8 Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

4.9 WATER COMMENTS: On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

#### Pre-Application Consultation

4.10 Proposals for a significantly larger extension with demolition of the existing coach house were the subject of a pre-application (PRE/13/01741). A subsequent application was then submitted but later withdrawn in response to officer comments. The current revised scheme has been the subject of extensive discussions with officers prior to submission.

### **5.0 Policy Context**

#### Introduction

5.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
- (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 5.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that 'if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'.

The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (DPD) (adopted in June 2011), those saved policies in the adopted Lewisham Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) that have not been replaced by the Core Strategy and policies in the London Plan (July 2011). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

#### National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.
- 5.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy and saved UDP policies for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

#### Other National Guidance

- 5.5 The other relevant national guidance is:  
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  
Design

#### London Plan (July 2011)

- 5.6 The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:  
Policy 7.6 Architecture  
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

#### Core Strategy

- 5.7 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the London Plan and the saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, is the borough's statutory development plan.

The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy

Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham  
Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

#### Unitary Development Plan (2004)

- 5.8 The saved policies of the UDP relevant to this application are:
- URB 3 Urban Design
  - URB 6 Alterations and Extensions
  - URB 16 New Development, Changes of Use and Alterations to Buildings in Conservation Areas
  - URB 20 Locally Listed Buildings
  - HSG 4 Residential Amenity
  - HSG 12 Residential Extensions

#### Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

- 5.9 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, storage, recycling facilities and bin storage, noise insulation, parking, cycle parking and storage, gardens and amenity space, landscaping, play space, Lifetime Homes and accessibility, and materials.

#### Emerging Plans

- 5.10 According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:
- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
  - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
  - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the merging plan to the policies in the NPPF the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework the greater the weight that may be given. The following emerging plans are relevant to this application.

#### Development Management

- 5.11 The Council submitted the Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) for examination in November 2013. The Examination in Public has now concluded, and the Inspector has issued his report on the 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2014 finding the Plan sound subject to 16 main modifications. The 16 main modifications had previously been published by the Council for public consultation on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April 2014.
- 5.12 The Council expects to formally adopt the DMLP in autumn 2014.

- 5.13 As set out in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework, emerging plans gain weight as they move through the plan making process. The DMLP as amended by the 16 main modifications has undergone all stages of the plan making process aside from formal adoption, and therefore holds very significant weight at this stage.
- 5.14 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:
- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| DM Policy 1  | Presumption in favour of sustainable development   |
| DM Policy 22 | Sustainable design and construction  |
| DM Policy 25 | Landscaping and trees  |
| DM Policy 30 | Urban design and local character   |
| DM Policy 31 | Alterations/extensions to existing buildings   |
| DM Policy 36 | New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens |
| DM Policy 37 | Non designated heritage assets including locally listed buildings, areas of special local character and areas of archaeological interest   |
| DM Policy 38 | Demolition or substantial harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets  |

## **6.0 Planning Considerations**

- 6.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of the current application are the scale and appearance of the proposed works in relation to the house, streetscene and the context of the wider Forest Hill Conservation Area. Consideration also needs to be given to the impact on neighbouring amenity.

### Design

- 6.2 With regards to design, this application has been considered in relation to policies URB 6 and URB 3 of the UDP, DM Policy 31 and 30, Core Strategy Policy 15 and the Council's Residential standards SPD.
- 6.3 Saved Policy URB 3 relates to urban design and maintains that proposed developments should be in scale and character with the existing surrounding development and the host dwelling. It also maintains that development should be compatible with its setting. DM Policy 30 also seeks to ensure that the proposed development relates to the urban typology of the area whilst creating a positive relationship with the existing streetscene.
- 6.4 The proposed ground floor extension and sunken terraces are located to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the public realm, when viewed from Honor Oak Road. To this extent the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the wider streetscene.
- 6.5 To the rear, most properties, including the application site, have large rear gardens. Unlike the street frontages, which have an established building line, there is less consistency to the rear and side of the properties as a number have later extensions and alterations. This lends itself to a more informal rear elevation.



The later additions to the rear, including the Coach House and porch, create a massing of three distinct bays. These three bays have an incremental change in subservience, decreasing in height from the main body of the house.

- 6.6 In relation to the impact of the extension and alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider Conservation Area, the Council's Conservation officer has not objected to the proposal and provided the following assessment *'The lower ground floor and upper ground floor elements in the extension are confined to the rear and north side of the plot. This is the site currently occupied by a Coach House extension which appears to date from the mid-1950s and is certainly post war in date. The majority of the above ground proposed development therefore occurs in a non-historic part of the property and consists of a lower ground floor extension of that part and an upper ground floor remodelling of the rear of the Coach House. The proposed lower ground floor extension is significant in size but its impact on the historic property is limited by its low profile, which is partly a result of the differing floor levels to the Coach House. The proposed extension is subsidiary in character to the historic building.'*
- 6.7 The applicant has provided detail material samples to demonstrate the finish of the proposed extension, these include the use of brick, Portland Stone and Crittall windows. Officers have reviewed the samples and consider them to be of high quality which would enhance the rear elevation of the 1950s Couch House. Therefore, in this instance, the nature and scale of the existing building, location to the rear of the Coach House, low profile of the proposal, use of high quality materials and size of the rear garden would together all minimise the visual impact of the proposal. It is therefore considered to be an acceptable alteration that would not significantly harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or wider Conservation Area.
- 6.8 Minor alterations would be made to the front of the coach house, including the removal of the existing wooden doors and the installation of replacement white timber windows. The installation of replacement sliding sash windows to the upper floor windows would enhance the appearance of the coach house. Timber cladding would be added at ground floor level to partially replicate the existing design of the coach doors. The coach house itself is set back from the front building line of the main dwelling and is further set back from the road by a large drive-way. There is also a considerable amount of screening from trees and shrubs to the front of the property. The alterations to the front are confined to the coach house and are considered to be sympathetic in their design and would generally enhance the appearance of existing coach house. They are therefore considered to be acceptable alterations that would not harm the character or appearance of the building, streetscene or wider conservation area.
- 6.9 An extension would also be made to the existing basement level accommodation to the rear of the main property and this would include a sunken terrace. The basement extension would primarily be subterranean and would therefore have no impact on the character or appearance of the application property. The only visible element would be the sunken terrace, which would provide access to the basement. This terrace would be located below the current established ground level and would therefore have a minimal impact on the appearance of the property. The size of the rear garden, at approximately 52m in depth, can comfortably accommodate such an alteration.

- 6.10 The dormer and sun tunnel would be located to the rear of the property. The dormer is considered to be of a proportion and size that is subservient to the existing dwelling. There are two existing roof lights that would be removed under the current scheme which would help to symplify the design of the roof. The design and location of the dormer is considered to be sympathetic to the existing property as takes into account the linear proportions of the bay windows below. The proposed sun tunnel would be located between two chimney stacks and would not be visible from Honor Oak Road. The Council's conservation officer has not objected to the proposed roof alterations and given the limited visibility of the dormer from the public realm, officers consider that the design, size and proportions are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would be acceptable alterations.

#### Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.11 Saved policies HSG4 and HSG12of the UDP and DM Policy 31 of the Local Plan seeks to protect residential amenity; safeguarding the character and amenities of residential areas. When seeking permission for extensions/alterations to existing buildings it must be demonstrated that significant harm will not arise with respect to overbearing impact, loss of outlook, overshadowing, loss of light, overlooking, loss or privacy or general noise and disturbance.
- 6.12 The proposed ground floor extension would be located to the rear of the coach house and abut the common boundary with No 76 Honor Oak Road. Concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents about the size in the extension and the differences in ground level between the sites. The applicant has provided additional information in form of drawings to clarify and demonstrate the profile of the extention and its relationship with the neighbouring property. The extension itself has has been designed to have a low profile and it would sit significantly lower than the neighbouring property and existing fence line. In this respect its visual impact, in terms of it being overbearing or visually intrusive would be negligible. No 76 is located north east of the site, however due to the height and low prfile of the extension there would be no loss of light or overshadowing onto the neighbouring property.
- 6.13 The main bulk of the ground floor extension would be set away from the neighbouring property at No 80 Honor Oak Road, which has a similar ground level to the application property and has not been extended at the rear. This property is also located to the south west of the application site. The distance of the proposed extension from the common boundary, low profile and orientation of the site would render the visual impact on No 80 acceptable.
- 6.14 The proposed extensions and terraces are sunken and generally below the establish ground level of the application site. There would therefore be minimal overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties beyond the current situation.
- 6.15 The additional changes to the coach house would also include the refurbishment of the rear elevation and the installation of new black steel windows at first floor level. No changes would be made to the overall height of the existing coach. The proposed windows would be located close to the common boundary, however there are already a number of windows located within the exsting elevation. As there is already an established precedent officers consider that the additional windows would not result in a significantly greater level of overlooking beyond what is already established.

- 6.16 The amendments to the front elevation of the coach house are considered to be minor and would utilise existing openings. No loss of privacy or overlooking is anticipated as a result of these changes.
- 6.17 The size and location of the rear dormer would not give rise to any significant impact on neighbouring amenity. There are two existing roof lights which would be removed under the current scheme and the addition of one small dormer window would not result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy. The dormer is therefore considered to be acceptable alteration .

#### Other matters

- 6.18 Concerns have been raised about the impact of the proposed basement extension and its structural implications for neighbouring properties. The applicant has provided a structural report for the existing house in support of the application, which concluded that there '*were no signs of structural distress in the lower ground floor*'. The structural implications of the proposal are however a building control matter that fall beyond the scope of planning considerations. They are therefore not considered as part of this application. However, officers have checked with the Council's building control department who have seen the plans and initially raised no objections to the principle of a basement extension but have advised that a building control application would need to be submitted for review.
- 6.19 Substantial landscaping works would also be made to the rear garden. There is one large existing tree located within the middle of the garden, however this would be retained. The original plans did also indicate the construction of a tree house, but this element has been removed from the plans under the advice of officers. The landscaping works appear acceptable.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy

- 6.20 The above development is not CIL liable.

### **7.0 Conclusion**

- 7.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 7.2 Officers consider that the proposed extensions and alterations are acceptable in terms of their form and design and would not harm the character or appearance of the property, streetscene or wider Forest Hill conservation area. The scheme is therefore considered acceptable and officers make the following recommendations:

### **8.0 RECOMMENDATION GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:**

- (1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

**Reason:** As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- (2) The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

2(01)00; 2(02)00; 2(03)00; 2(03)-01; 2(03)01; 2(03)02; 2(03)03; 2(03)RF; 2(04)00; 2(04)01; 2(04)02; 2(05)01; 2(05)02; 2(05)03; 2(11)00 Rev A; 2(12)00; 2(12)-01 Rev A; 2(12)02; 2(12)03; 2(12)RF; 2(13)00; 2(13)01 Rev A; 2(13)02; 2(13)04; 2(14)01 Rev A; 2(14)02 Rev B; 2(14)03 Rev B; 2(21)00 Rev A; 2(41)00; 2(42)00; 2(42)01; 2(42)02; 2(42)03; 2(42)04; Supplementary Massing Drawings; Solar Tube Specification Details; Solar Tube Indicative Photo; Design and Access Statement and Structural Survey Report.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

- (3) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofed extensions hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

**Reason:** In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Saved Policy HSG 4 Residential Amenity in the Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

## **INFORMATIVE**

- (1) Positive and Proactive Statement: The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.