

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	62 SIDDONS ROAD, LONDON SE23 2JQ	
Ward	Perry Vale	
Contributors	Malachy McGovern	
Class	PART 1	8 November 2012

Reg. No. DC/12/81018

Application dated 01.08.2012

Applicant Mr Nathan Jones

Proposal The construction of single storey extensions to the side and rear at 62 Siddons Road SE23, in connection with the existing ground floor flat.

Applicant's Plan No. 1794/1 Revision B

Background Papers

- (1) LE/384/62/TP
- (2) Adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)
- (3) Local Development Framework Documents
- (4) The London Plan

Designation Not in a Conservation Area

Screening N/A

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises a two-storey mid-terrace property currently in use as two self-contained flats, located on the eastern side of Siddons Road close to the junction with Shipman Road. The application relates to the ground floor flat.
- 1.2 The area is predominantly residential in nature with a mixture of Victorian, inter-war and modern housing.
- 1.3 The properties along Siddons Road have two storey rear 'closet wings' and quite modest rear gardens. The neighbouring property to the north no. 64 Siddons Road has a small rear garden with an irregular plot shape due to the layout of the housing terrace along Shipman Road.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 There is no relevant planning history for the site.

3.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposal

- 3.1 The current application seeks to construct a single-storey side and rear ground floor extension to the property. The roof of the side element would slope upwards from

the eastern boundary with a gentle pitch and would incorporate 4 no. velux style roof lights.

- 3.2 The applicant submitted a revision to the scheme which reduced the projection of the proposed extension (from the rear building line of the closet wing) from 3 metres to 2 metres.

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 A site notice was displayed and letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

- 4.3 4 Objections were received from neighbouring occupiers of properties and one further objection has been made where no address has been provided. Two of the 4 objections came from the same household
- 4.4 The objections were on the following grounds
- 1) Light Loss – The neighbour immediately north of the site has raised objections on the grounds that the proposed extension would significantly reduce light to the ground floor rear kitchen window of their property and has requested that the extension be reduced to 1.5 metres in depth from the rear building line. The neighbour immediately south has instructed an agent to make formal submissions objecting on the grounds of loss of light. Two neighbours have stated that the proposed development would not comply with the 45 degree rule guidance or with the 'right of light' legislation.
 - 2) Scale & Massing - The neighbour immediately south has raised concerns about the overall massing of the extension suggesting that the pitched roof element should terminate at the line of the rear closet wing and not extend beyond it.
 - 3) Maintenance and Party Wall Issues – A neighbour has raised concerns about the maintenance of the resultant valley or butterfly roof that would result from the two side extensions should the proposed extension be built.
 - 4) Trees – There is a mature tree in the garden of the adjoining property no. 60. A neighbour would like assurances that this would be protected.
 - 5) Party Wall Issues – The neighbour would like assurances that the development would be 20mm from the extension to no. 60 in order to ensure neighbourliness and accommodate any possible expansion

Written Responses received from Statutory Agencies

No responses

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.

5.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

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

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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 that (paragraph 211), 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. In summary, this states, that for a period of 12 months from publication of the NPPF decision takers can give full weight to policies adopted since 2004 even if there is limited conflict with the NPPF. Following this period weight should be given to existing policies according to their consistency with the NPPF.

5.5 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, 214 and 215 of the NPPF.

5.6 Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011)

The statement sets out that the planning system has a key role to play in rebuilding Britain's economy by ensuring that the sustainable development needed to support economic growth is able to proceed as easily as possible. The Government's expectation is that the answer to development and growth should wherever possible be 'yes', except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in national planning policy.

5.7 Other National Guidance

The other relevant national guidance is:

By Design: Urban Design in the Planning System - Towards Better Practice (CABE/DETR 2000)

5.8 Relevant UDP policies include:

URB 3 'Urban Design'
URB 6 'Alterations and Extensions'
HSG 4 'Residential Amenity'
HSG 12 'Residential Extensions'

5.9 Relevant Core Strategy policies include

Policy 15 'High Quality Design for Lewisham'
Policy 8 'Sustainable Design and Construction and Energy Efficiency'

5.10 Residential Development Standards SPD (August 2006)

In August 2006, the Council adopted the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document. 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, back land development, 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.

5.11 London Plan 2011

Policy 7.4 'Local Character'
Policy 7.6 'Architecture'

6.0 Planning Considerations

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

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design
- c) Impact on Adjoining Properties
- d) Sustainability and Energy

Principle of Development

6.2 The application proposes to create a ground floor side and rear extension. The proposal would improve the existing internal living accommodation and provide a larger kitchen/ dining and living area for the existing 2 bedroom flat. As such, the proposal is considered to create a more sustainable use of the property

Design

- 6.3 The proposed extension would be full width and would project from the rear building line of the closet wing element by approximately 2 metres. The side element would be approximately 6.1 metres deep and would be set forward from the rear building line of the main building by approximately 1.8 metres.
- 6.4 The side infill element would have a sloping roof which would rise from a height of 2.5 metres to a maximum height of 3.5 metres at the raised parapet.
- 6.5 The side element would incorporate 4 x velux style roof lights which would be set within the roof slope and provide good natural light into the living / kitchen area. The remainder of the rear element would be flat roofed with a raised party wall on the boundary with no. 64 measuring approximately 2.6 metres above ground level.
- 6.6 The Lewisham SPD on Residential Standards states that rear extensions should reflect and enhance the appearance of the original building whatever its character or style. It is considered that the proposed side element would be of a similar pitched roof design and construction as the extension to the adjoining property at no. 60 and as such would be in keeping with the area.
- 6.7 It is considered that the extension is of an appropriate form, design and materials and would remain subordinate to the principal building being 2.5 metres high at eaves level with a small pitch to the side element. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in design terms.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 6.8 The proposed side element would have a sloping roof which is of a similar form and height as the existing lean to type side extension to no. 60. The proposal would project out only 2 metres beyond the rear building line and as such it is not considered that the extension would have a significant impact on no. 60 by reason of light loss. A neighbour has raised a concern about the potential butterfly form that would be created by the two sloping side additions (no. 60 & 62) and the potential maintenance implications however this is not considered to be a planning matter in determining the application.
- 6.9 The neighbouring property no. 64 is immediately north of the application property and as such would be more affected in terms of light. It is considered that whilst the extension would be noticeable, the proposed depth of just 2 metres and height of 2.5 metres at the boundary would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact and would not or cause an unacceptable reduction in daylight to the small rear kitchen window.
- 6.10 It is considered that whilst the proposed extension would have some impact on the neighbouring properties, on balance, this would not cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. The proposed extension would provide an improved kitchen/ dining and living area with a better layout and as such would represent a more sustainable use of the property. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

7.0 Local Finance Considerations

- 7.1 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:
- 7.2 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.
- 7.3 The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is not payable on this application.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered that the proposed extension would be subordinate to the principal building, and would be of a design and appearance that is appropriate in its context. The extension would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of light loss, privacy or physical presence.
- 8.2 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 8.3 On balance, Officers consider that the scheme is therefore considered acceptable.

9.0 Summary of Reasons for Grant of Planning Permission

- 9.1 It is considered that the proposed extension is appropriate in terms of its form and design and would not result in material harm to the appearance or character of the surrounding area, or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is thereby in accordance with Policies HSG 4 'Residential Amenity' and HSG12 'Residential Extensions' of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004), Policy 15 'High Quality Design for Lewisham' of the Lewisham Core Strategy (June 2011), and policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' of the London Plan (July 2011).

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

Conditions

The use of the extension shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof of the extension shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area of the extension be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area, without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

Reasons

In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011) and Policies URB 3 Urban Design, HSG 5 Layout and Design of New Residential Development and HSG 12 Residential Extensions in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).