

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	1A LENHAM ROAD SE12 8QN	
Ward	Lee Green	
Contributors	Russell Penn	
Class	PART 1	Date: 1 DECEMBER 2011

<u>Reg. No.</u>	DC/11/78306
<u>Application dated</u>	6 September 2011, completed 15 September 2011
<u>Applicant</u>	Waldron Architects on behalf of Mr and Mrs N De Souza
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a two storey, plus roof space extension to the side, extensions to the side and rear roofslopes and installation of 3 roof lights in the front roof slope.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	1102.01, 1102.PL04A, 07B, 08B, 09, Design and Access Statement & photographs.
<u>Background Papers</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Case File - LE/450/1A/TP (2) Adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) (3) Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (2011) (4) The London Plan (July 2011) (5) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Standards
<u>Zoning</u>	Adopted UDP - Existing Use LDF: Core Strategy

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 The application relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling sited on the eastern side of Lenham Road. The property is set back from the road with sufficient space for vehicle parking. The property has a lean-to garage to the side and a single storey rear extension. The site has an unusual triangular shape, being the first plot on the eastern side of Lenham Road. To the north and east of the application site are the rear gardens of properties in Lee High Road.
- 1.2 The site lies in a residential area comprising dwellings of varied age, size and design. Many of the properties have been extended and there are examples of contemporary architecture in close proximity of the site (1 & 2 Asra Villas).
- 1.3 The site is not located within a Conservation Area and is not listed.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 There is no recent relevant planning history relating to the property. The existing pair of semi detached houses were granted planning permission in 1953 and constructed shortly after.

3.0 Current Planning Application

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a two storey plus roof space side extension and roof extension to the rear roofslope of 1A Lenham Road SE12. This involves a hip to gable roof extension, the erection of a rear dormer, the installation of three roof lights in the front roof slope and the erection of a large two storey with roofspace side extension to provide an 'annexe' style extension to the main property.

4.0 Consultations and Replies

Neighbours & Local Amenity Societies etc

- 4.1 Consultation letters were sent to 62 neighbouring properties. A notice was displayed on site and Ward Councillors were consulted.
- 4.2 Four letters of objection have been received from adjacent occupiers at 1B Lenham Road and 352, 354 & 358 Lee High Road objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:-
- (1) Loss of privacy.
 - (2) Concern regarding the capacity on the existing drainage network that additional demand on its use would cause potential effluent flooding.
 - (3) Increase in the size of the property will increase noise levels in the vicinity.
 - (4) The design of the scheme is unsympathetic and will unbalance the semi detached property.
 - (5) The new roof line will block evening sun to property to the rear of the site.
 - (6) Concern regarding the use of the property for hotel or hostel use.

(Letters are available to Members)

5.0 Policy Context

London Plan

- 5.1 The London Plan was published in July 2011. Policies that are relevant to the application are:-

Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure

Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.5 Public realm
Policy 7.6 Architecture

Local Development Framework – Core Strategy

- 5.2 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with 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:
- 5.3 The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:-

Objective 1: Physical and socio-economic benefits
Objective 5: Climate change
Objective 6: Flood risk reduction and water management
Objective 10: Protect and enhance Lewisham's character
Spatial Policy 1: Lewisham Spatial Policy
Spatial Policy 5: Areas of Stability and Managed Change
Policy 7: Climate change and adapting to the effects
Policy 8: Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency
Policy 15: High quality design for Lewisham

Adopted Unitary Development Plan

- 5.4 The relevant saved policies of the UDP (adopted July 2004) includes:-
- URB 3 Urban Design
URB 6 Extensions and Alterations
HSG 4 Residential Amenity
HSG 12 Residential Extensions

6.0 Planning Considerations

- 6.1 The main planning considerations are the impact of the proposal on the character of the property and surrounding area, and the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Regard should also be given to sustainability.

Amenity for occupiers of host property

- 6.2 The proposed extension would provide additional habitable accommodation in the main dwelling by way of a bedroom in the roofspace and a large annexe which would accommodate 3 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms and a living room. It has been stated that the annexe is required in connection with the main dwelling, not as a separate residential unit. Although the annexe would have its own front door, the upper floors can only be accessed from within the original part of the building, which would make it difficult to separate the side extension as an

independent unit. Nevertheless as a precaution, given the size of the side extension and facilities provided within it, Officers consider it appropriate to attach a condition to the planning approval to prevent future subdivision of the annexe into a separate self contained dwelling.

- 6.3 The proposal would significantly increase the size of the property and amount of accommodation available for its occupiers. The extension would result in the loss of the garage and a section of the garden but there would still be ample off-street parking in the front drive and the rear garden would still be of adequate size for the family dwelling.

Visual Impact

- 6.4 National and local planning policies place considerable emphasis on the importance of achieving high quality design that complements existing development, established townscape and character. Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Standards sets out guidance for all residential extensions. All extensions should be sensitively designed to retain the architectural integrity of the building.
- 6.5 It is important to note that there is a wide range of architectural styles within this locality . Many of the properties have been altered/extended and therefore the proposal should be viewed in the context of its surroundings.
- 6.6 For design reasons the planning authority usually seeks to resist hip-to-gable roof extensions on semi-detached properties as this un-balances the appearance of the semi-detached pair which can be detrimental to the appearance of the dwellings and visual amenity of the streetscene. However, in this instance the proposed hip-to-gable extension is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.7 The appearance of the semi-detached pair has already been compromised by virtue of the lean-to garage extension on the application site and the front porch/garage extension on the adjoining property. The proposed side extension would significantly alter the appearance of the host property and would totally change the visual relationship of the property to its adjoining neighbour. Consequently the roof extension in this instance is considered to be an appropriate alteration. The roof extension would be constructed of materials to match the existing roof which is acceptable in design terms.
- 6.8 The proposed front rooflights would be well positioned within the roof slope. The roof is of adequate size to accommodate three rooflights without detriment to the character of appearance of the dwelling.
- 6.9 The proposed rear roof extension complies with the design criteria of the Council's SPD: Residential Standards by virtue of its size and position in the roofslope. The dormer style extension would be well contained within the extended slope, set down from the ridge, up from the eaves and in from the party wall. The dormer would be clad in standing seam, lead coloured steel sheeting which would match the roofing material proposed for the side extension. The dormer would include a Juliette balcony with glass balustrade and is considered to be of acceptable design.

- 6.10 The proposed side extension has been designed to appear as two elements. The extension is a contemporary design with a 'cat slide' roof to the front which provides an interesting contrast to the existing building. Although large in size the extension would appear as a subservient addition to the original dwelling as a result of its footprint, scale, roof pitch and materials. The largest element of the extension would maintain the established front building line of the property but would be set down from the main ridge. The roof would mirror the pitch of the gable on the main dwelling but would step down in height. The second smaller element of the extension would step back from the front elevation and would also step down in height. The step back and reduction in height helps to break up the mass of the extension.
- 6.11 The use of a modern materials palette (white render/Western Red Cedar boarding/lead coloured standing seam roof) results in a crisp appearance which contrasts well with the existing property and draws upon other contemporary designs within the street.
- 6.12 There is a large area of render on the rear elevation which Officers felt could be broken up by the insertion of a window. However, the applicant does not want a window in this location as they would like to maximise internal wall space. As the rear elevation will not be visible from any public viewpoint this is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.13 The plot is of adequate size to accommodate the proposal without appearing cramped or overdeveloped. Overall the proposal is well designed and would not harm the character or appearance of the host building or visual amenity of the streetscene.

Neighbour Amenity

- 6.14 Policy HSG4 seeks to protect residential amenity. When seeking permission for extensions/alterations to existing buildings it must be demonstrated that significant harm will not arise in respect of overbearing impact, loss of outlook, overshadowing, loss of light, overlooking, loss or privacy or general noise and disturbance.
- 6.15 Given the orientation of the application site in relation to its neighbours, the distance that will be retained between the extension and properties in Lee High Road and the dense boundary screening separating properties, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity by way of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing impact or loss of outlook.
- 6.16 The windows in the side elevation of the extension would overlook the side garden of the application site which is acceptable.
- 6.17 The windows at first floor level in the rear of the extension and the dormer windows would provide views onto the rear elevations of properties in Lee High Road but given the distance between facing elevations, the change in ground levels and dense boundary screening, the level of overlooking would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy. In any event mutual overlooking at first floor already exists.

- 6.18 The rear dormer windows and Juliette balcony would provide views onto the roof of the neighbouring conservatory and the rear garden of the neighbouring property. An objection has been raised in this respect. However, the existing first floor rear window of the application site already provides views onto the roof of the neighbouring conservatory. The fenestration in the dormer would be located further away than the existing window; so while there would be the opportunity for additional overlooking, it is not considered that this would be so detrimental so as to warrant refusal of this application.
- 6.19 A Juliette balcony is proposed which adds an increased level of amenity to occupiers of the application site and is often a welcome feature for providing additional light and natural ventilation into a room beyond what can be provided by a small window. However, Juliette balconies do not facilitate the same level of overlooking as a full balcony/roof terrace as they do not provide the opportunity to sit outside at roof level. Occupiers of the bedroom may sit in the window to benefit from the open door to the Juliette balcony but in reality this would not facilitate a significantly greater level of overlooking than occupiers sitting behind an open window.
- 6.20 Concerns have been raised about increased noise levels as a result of the significant increase in size of the property. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension is large and would in effect double the size of the existing dwelling. Nevertheless the site is of adequate size to accommodate the proposed extension without appearing cramped or overdeveloped. The majority of the additional accommodation would be provided on the northwest side of the property, sited away from adjoining neighbours. It is not unusual for some residential dwellings to be occupied by large families, indeed there is a need within the Borough for larger family sized dwellings. Overall it is not considered that use of the additional accommodation as an extension to the existing household would generate an unacceptable level of noise or disturbance beyond what is reasonably expected from occupation of a dwellinghouse.
- 6.21 Use of the extension as a separate self contained dwelling would require further consideration and may not be acceptable. For this reason a condition will be attached to this consent to restrict the use of the extension as an annexe.
- 6.22 For the reasons stated it is not considered that the proposal would compromise the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Sustainability

- 6.23 The proposal complies with the principle of extending an existing building and maximises the use of an existing site. All habitable rooms would benefit from good levels of natural light and ventilation. For a development of this scale it is not considered appropriate or necessary to insist upon the inclusion of renewable energy facilities.

Other Issues

- 6.24 The adjoining neighbour (1B Lenham Road) has raised concern about the impact of the development on surface water run-off and sewer drainage. It has been stated that the existing private drains serving 1A and 1B Lenham Road are already prone to blockage and this would be exacerbated by the significant increase in accommodation and knock on water use within the property.

- 6.25 The planning authority does not usually consult Thames Water in respect of residential extensions. However, in this instance Officers have discussed the application with Thames Water who have confirmed that the sewer at 1A is a private sewer at the start of the sewer run so would not be maintained by Thames Water but the sewer at 1B would be maintained by Thames Water. Consequently if problems with the sewer drains are experienced on the neighbouring property, Thames Water would be able to deal with this issue.
- 6.26 Building Control Officers have confirmed that as part of the Building Regulations process Thames Water would be consulted on the proposed extension but it is not anticipated that any issues would arise in respect of increased water use.
- 6.27 The issue of sewer drainage and maintenance is in fact a private matter between land owners and could not form a reason for refusal of planning permission.
- 6.28 In respect of surface water run-off and flood risk such issues should be taken into account when considering applications for new development. This site is not located within an area of flood risk and in any event it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to a significant increase in surface water run-off or lead to flooding.

7.0 Consultations

- 7.1 With regard to procedural matters, neighbour notifications have been carried out in accordance with the Council's usual procedures.
- 7.2 Officers are satisfied that all statutory Council procedures have been followed.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is not considered that the extension would harm visual or residential amenity and therefore approval is recommended.

9.0 Summary of Reasons for Grant of Planning Permission

- 9.1 On balance, it is considered that the proposal satisfies the Council's Land Use and environmental criteria and is in accordance with Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and retained Policies URB 3 Urban Design and URB 6 Alterations and Extensions in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
- 9.2 It is considered that the proposal 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 Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and retained Policies URB 3 Urban Design, URB 6 Alterations and Extensions and HSG 12 Residential Extensions in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

10.0 RECOMMENDATION GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

- (1) The extension hereby approved shall be used for purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of 1A Lenham Road as a single dwellinghouse and at no time shall the extension hereby approved be occupied as a separate dwelling.
- (2) The hip-to-gable roof extension hereby approved shall be constructed of materials to match the existing roof. The dormer shall be clad in standing seam, lead coloured steel sheeting and the side extension shall be constructed of white render, Western Red cedar boarding and lead effect standing seam cladding in accordance with drawing no. 1102.PL.08B hereby approved.
- (3) B09 Plumbing or Pipes

Reasons

- (1) In the interests of protecting the amenity of occupiers of the application site and neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy HSG 4 Residential Amenity within the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).
- (2) To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building(s) and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011) and Policy URB 3 Urban Design in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004).

Informative

Construction Sites Code of Practice or any other such codes applicable at the time of construction.