

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C	
Report Title	46 RINGMORE RISE, LONDON, SE23 3DE	
Ward	FOREST HILL	
Contributors	SAMUEL JAMES	
Class	PART 1	31 October 2019

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/19/110358
<u>Application dated</u>	03 January 2019
<u>Applicant</u>	HP Architects on Behalf of Mr Cummings
<u>Applicants Plan Nos.</u>	1149/EX-01 Rev.A; 1149/EX-02 Rev.A; 1149/EX-03; 1149/PL-01 Rev.A; 1149/PL-02 Rev.A; Site Location Plan
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a single storey extension with crown roof to the rear of 46 Ringmore Rise SE23, together with the provision of a bin and refuse store at the front.
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Core Strategy (adopted June 2011) (2) Development Management Local Plan (adopted November 2014) (3) Local Development Framework Documents (4) The London Plan
<u>Designation</u>	PTAL 3

## 1 SUMMARY

- 1 This report sets out Officer's recommendations for the above proposal. The report has been brought before members for a decision as the recommendation is to approve and there are at least three valid planning objections.

## 2 SITE AND CONTEXT

- 2 The application property is located on the southern side of the road, just east of the right-angle bend that links the top of Ringmore Rise round to Horniman Drive. The existing property is a bungalow. The floor level of the bungalow is set below street level by about 2 metres. The plot measures 34.5 metres deep, by 13.5 metres wide at the front boundary, increasing to 16m wide at the rear boundary. One flank of the roofslope is hipped and the other has a gable end.
- 3 To the east are the rear gardens of houses at 30, 32 and 34 Horniman Drive. 30 Horniman Drive has a garage at the foot of its rear garden, which is accessed from Ringmore Rise, immediately adjoining the front forecourt of the application site. The rear garden of 46 Ringmore Rise falls away steeply towards the grounds of Horniman School to the south.
- 4 The site lies high on the Forest Hill ridge within the Tewkesbury Lodge Estate, in a residential area which comprises dwellings dating mainly from the inter-war period. The vast majority of properties in this part of Ringmore Rise are detached houses. Most are

two-storey, but there are several bungalows, such as that on the application site. The site is in an elevated location and the surrounding ground level slopes downwards towards the north and west, so that most houses have impressive views north and west toward central London. The topography is such that houses on the east side of Ringmore Rise are elevated by several metres above road level, whereas the properties on the west of the road, such as the application property have their ground levels set a metre or even several metres below the road.

- 5 The far end of Ringmore Rise has a consistent roofscape of hipped roofs however closer to the site there is greater variation in roof form including pitched roofs, hip to gable extensions and other individually design properties such as No.30 Horniman Drive, located on the corner of Horniman Drive and Ringmore Rise.
- 6 The property is not within a conservation area nor is it subject to an Article 4 Direction. The property is not nor is it adjacent to a listed building. The PTAL rating is 3.

### 3 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 7 **DC/13/85703** – Planning permission was refused for the demolition of existing bungalow at 46 Ringmore Rise and the construction of 2 part one/part three-storey, 4 bedroom semi-detached houses, together with the provision of 2 car parking spaces and associated landscaping, for the reason that:-

"The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate scale and mass was considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site, and would cause a significant and unacceptable impact on the occupiers of 30-34 Horniman Drive and 44 Ringmore Rise."

The proposal was dismissed at appeal in September 2014.

- 8 **DC/14/86815** – May 2014 – A Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed) was issued in respect of the construction of a single storey rear extension at 46 Ringmore Rise, together with the conversion of the existing garage to provide additional residential accommodation.
- 9 **DC/14/87162** – 11 June 2014 – Planning permission was refused for the construction of a single-storey front and side infill extension and an additional storey at first floor level, plus new roof, to provide a four-bedroom house at 46 Ringmore Rise, together with the provision of 1 car parking space, for the following reasons:-

"The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate scale and mass is considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site, and would cause a significant and unacceptable impact on the occupiers of 30-34 Horniman Drive and 44 Ringmore Rise and result in an over-dominant feature in the street scene in this part of Ringmore Rise, contrary to Objective 10: Protect and Enhance Lewisham's Character and Policy 15: High Quality Design for Lewisham of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy (June 2011) and emerging policies DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character and Policy 32 Infill, Backland, Back Garden and Garden Amenity Area Development of the Development Management Local Plan (Submission Version - August 2013) and saved policies URB 3 Urban Design, HSG 4 Residential Amenity, HSG 5 Layout and Design of New Residential Development & HSG 8 Backland and Infill Development of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004)."

The applicant lodged a successful appeal against the decision and the scheme was allowed on the 30th of April 2015 under appeal decision APP/C5690/D/14/2225090 for the following reasons:

The development would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The development would not cause material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

This permission was never implemented and lapsed on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2018.

- 10 **DC/14/88500** – 8 September 2014 – The Council confirmed that prior approval was required for the construction of a single-storey rear extension at 46 Ringmore Rise - The extension will extend 8 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house, the maximum height will be 3 metres and the height at the eaves of the proposed extension will be 3 metres.
  - 11 **DC/14/88701** – 31 October 2014 – Planning permission was granted for the demolition of the existing garage and construction of a single-storey extension to the side of 46 Ringmore Rise, together with the excavation of a new lower ground floor to provide additional accommodation, with light wells to the front and projecting glazed roof light to the rear, alterations to the front garden, including new vehicular crossover, driveway and landscaped areas.
  - 12 **DC/14/89609** – 1 December 2014 – The Council confirmed that prior approval was not required for the proposed single storey extension that would extend 8m beyond the rear wall of existing dwelling. At the rear wall of the existing dwelling, the extension would be 3m in height sloping to 2m in height 1.7m from the existing rear wall. Then the extension submerges into the existing surface with a flat roof that is 2.05m high at natural ground level at the rear of the extension.
  - 13 **DC/14/89595** – 12 December 2014 – A certificate of Lawful Development was issued in respect of the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a single storey extension to the side of 46 Ringmore Rise.
  - 14 **DC/14/90131** – 4th February 2014 – A Certificate of Lawful Development was issued for the construction of two hip to gable roof extensions and a dormer in the rear roof slope at 46 Ringmore Rise SE23, together with obscure glazed windows in the gable end.
  - 15 **DC/15/91023** – Planning permission was granted for the demolition of the existing green house and garage to the side of 46 Ringmore Rise SE23 and the construction of a single storey side extension incorporating living space.
  - 16 **DC/15/91580** – A Lawful Development Certificate (proposed) was refused in respect of a single storey rear extension at 46 Ringmore Rise SE23. The decision was subsequently appealed and dismissed.
  - 17 **DC/15/90901** – Planning permission was refused for the construction of two hip to gable roof extensions and a dormer in the rear roof slope at 46 Ringmore Rise SE23, together with obscure glazed windows in the gable end. The refusal was appealed and allowed.
  - 18 **DC/15/92466** – Planning permission was granted the construction of a single storey extension with crown roof to the rear 46 Ringmore Rise.
- It is noted that the above permission is for an extension almost identical to the one proposed here. This permission lapsed on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2018.
- 19 **DC/16/97710** – Planning permission was granted for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear of 46 Ringmore Rise SE23.

The scale and massing of the rear extension approved above is virtually identical to the extension proposed here.

20 **DC/18/106932** – Planning permission was granted at committee for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a single-storey front and side infill extension, an additional storey at first floor level, plus new roof incorporating 8 roof lights, to provide a four-bedroom house at 46 Ringmore Rise SE23, together with the provision of 1 car parking space.

21 **DC/18/109965** – There is a concurrent live application being considered for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a ground and lower ground floor extension to the side, excavation to create a new lower ground floor level, creation of 2 lightwells to the front and a lightwell to the rear with a glazed rooflight above at 46 Ringmore Rise, SE23, together with alterations to the front garden landscaping, installation of a new vehicular crossover to create an in-out driveway, bicycle store and tree planting.

#### **4 CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATION**

22 The current application proposes to construct a single storey extension with crown roof to the rear of 46 Ringmore Rise SE23, together with the provision of a bin and refuse store at the front. The proposal would extend 4m from the rear wall of the main building and 3.7m to the projection, with a width of 8.93m which would be 2.1m away from the boundary of the adjoining neighbours at No.44 Ringmore Rise and 3.25m away from the shared boundary at No.30 Horniman Drive. The extension would have a crown roof with a maximum height of 4m (measured from ground level adjacent to the existing rear elevation) and the eaves height of 3.45m to the sides.

23 The external walls of the proposed extension would be in white painted render to match the existing material and the proposed crown roofing would be in tiles matching the existing roof. Two set of windows and doors would be installed to the rear which will provide the access to the rear garden. A fixed obscure window is proposed to each side of the proposed extension. Proposed windows and doors would be timber framed according to the plan. A set of two identical rooflights would be fixed on to the slopes of the proposed roof to the sides.

24 Due to the slope of the ground level from the front to the rear of the garden, steps are proposed to provide access to the rear garden.

25 A bin and cycle storage at 1.2m by 2m is proposed to the front.

#### **5 CONSULTATION**

##### **5.1 APPLICATION PUBLICITY**

26 The Council's consultation was undertaken in accordance with the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

27 Letters were sent to adjoining residents in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors on 14/01/2019. The applicant displayed a site notice on 01/02/2019.

28 Three letter of objections have been received the neighbours. The summary of objections are listed below:

### 5.1.1 Objections

Material planning consideration	Para where addressed
Lose the open aspect of their garden;	55, 56, 57
Would be oppressive and impact on outlook	55, 56, 57
Extension will not be aesthetically pleasing.	52, 53
Increased sense of enclosure to neighbours	55, 56, 57
Overshadowing to neighbours properties	55, 56, 57
Loss of Privacy to neighbours	63
Extension would result in neighbouring occupiers feeling 'hemmed in'.	55, 56, 57
Extension would be over development	46, 49

29 The following concerns, which are non-material to this application were also raised, as follows:

- There have been a large number of previous planning applications and permissions at the property and neighbours are concerned as they do not know the applicant's intentions. Officer comment: The number of previous applications is not relevant to the planning decision before members.

## 6 POLICY CONTEXT

### 6.1 LEGISLATION

30 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (S38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 Town & Country Planning Act 1990).

### 6.2 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

31 A material consideration is anything that, if taken into account, creates the real possibility that a decision-maker would reach a different conclusion to that which they would reach if they did not take it into account.

32 Whether or not a consideration is a relevant material consideration is a question of law for the courts. Decision-makers are under a duty to have regard to all applicable policy as a material consideration.

33 The weight given to a relevant material consideration is a matter of planning judgement. Matters of planning judgement are within the exclusive province of the LPA. This report sets out the weight Officers have given relevant material considerations in making their recommendation to Members. Members, as the decision-makers, are free to use their planning judgement to attribute their own weight, subject to the test of reasonableness.

34 Draft London Plan: The Mayor of London published a draft London Plan on 29 November 2017 and minor modifications were published on 13 August. The Examination in Public commenced on 15 January 2019 and concluded on 22 May 2019. Following

the Examination in Public, an updated draft new London Plan was published, consolidated with suggested changes in July 2019. This document has some weight as a material consideration when determining planning applications. The relevant draft policies are discussed within the report (DLPP).

### **6.3 NATIONAL POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance

### **6.4 DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

35 The Development Plan comprises:

- London Plan Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011 (March 2016) (LPP)
- Core Strategy (June 2011) (CSP)
- Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) (DMP)
- Site Allocations Local Plan (June 2013)

### **6.5 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE**

36 Lewisham SPD:

- Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2019)

37 London Plan SPG/SPD

- Sustainable Design and Construction (April 2014)
- Housing (March 2016)

## **7 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

38 The main issues are:

- Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Impact on highways

### **7.1 PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

#### ***Discussion***

39 The Council are supportive of householders extending their homes in principle, subject to the impact of the extension on the appearance of the house, the surrounding area and on neighbouring residential amenity.

40 As there is a lapsed permission for an almost identical proposal at the same property (DC/15/92466), whether there are any material changes in policy, or to the surrounding area since that proposal was granted must also be considered.

41 That application was determined under the same development plan as is relevant now, and there are no significant changes to Council Policy regarding extensions to households that would allow a different assessment now. However, it should be acknowledged that the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2019) has been adopted, replacing the former Residential Standards SPD which the previous permission would have been assessed against.

42 Both the superseded Residential Standards SPD (2012) and the adopted Alterations and Extensions SPD (2019) seek to ensure extensions are subordinate to the main structure, do not harm the character of the surrounding area, and do not harm the residential amenity of neighbours. There is no guidance in the 2019 SPD which would allow a different outcome in assessment for this application.

## 7.2 URBAN DESIGN

### *General Policy*

43 Core Strategy Policy 15 requires that for all development in Lewisham, the Council will seek the highest quality design.

44 DM Policy 30 sets out the Council's objectives for urban design and local character throughout the Borough. The policy seeks to achieve a high standard of design in all development proposals.

45 DM Policy 31 provides standards for alterations and extensions to existing buildings within the Borough including residential extensions.

46 Specific regard is also given to the Council's Alterations and Extensions SPD which states that extensions should be smaller and less bulky than the original building and reflect its form and shape. In general, the extension complies with the guidance in the Alterations and Extensions SPD.

### *Discussion*

#### *Rear Extension*

47 The proposed extension would be single storey in height, and would remain subordinate to the existing house, due to its set-down roof ridgeline. The eaves would match the main house, which is appropriate for a bungalow extension.

48 The maximum height of the proposal is noted as 4m on the elevations, but this is measured from ground level at the rear wall of the existing house. When measured at the rear wall of the extension, due to the sloping ground level away from the house, the maximum height would be 5.2m, and the eaves height would be 4.1m.

49 Although this is relatively high for a rear extension, it is due to the sloping nature of the garden, and the proposed extension is still considered to be a subordinate addition, which would not over-dominate the host property. The matching eaves height, and matching pitch of the roof ensure the extension respects the form and architectural integrity of the host property.

50 The 4m depth is acceptable considering the overall length and width of the existing garden, of which well over the 50% required by Policy DM31 would remain as a result.

51 The walls would be white painted render externally to match the main house, and the roof would be tiled to match which is acceptable. No objections are raised to the proposed doors and windows.

#### *Bicycle and Refuse Store*

52 As the bicycle and refuse store would be visible from the public realm

#### *Summary*

53 The proposed rear extension is of an acceptable design quality and would be subordinate to the host dwelling, in line with Policies CS15, DM30 and DM31. The proposed design is policy compliant, and therefore it is acceptable.

54 Notwithstanding this assessment, an almost identical extension was approved at the property under application DC/15/92466.

## **8 LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEIGHBOURS**

### *General Policy*

55 NPPF para 127 sets an expectation that new development will be designed to create places that amongst other things have a 'high standard' of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in relevant policies of the London Plan (LP7.6), the Core Strategy (CP15), the Local Plan (DMP32) and associated guidance (Housing SPD 2017, GLA; Residential Standards SPD 2012, LBL).

56 DMP31 expects residential extensions adjacent to dwellings to not result in significant loss of privacy or amenity (including sunlight and daylight) to adjoining properties.

57 The main impacts on amenity usually arise from: (i) overbearing enclosure/loss of outlook; (ii) loss of privacy; (iii) loss of daylight within properties and loss of sunlight to amenity areas; and (iv) noise and disturbance.

58 The main properties to consider in an assessment of the impacts of the proposal upon neighbouring residential amenity are 44 Ringmore Rise. As the host property also borders the rear boundaries of Nos.30, 32, and 34 Horniman Drive, the impact on those properties is also a consideration.

### **Enclosure and Outlook, Daylight and Sunlight**

59 *44 Ringmore Rise:* The extension would be approximately 2m from the shared boundary with No.44, and 3m from its side elevation, and it would have a depth of 3.3m past its original rear elevation. However, there is an existing conservatory with a depth of approximately 3m, meaning the extension would marginally extend past the existing rear elevation of the conservatory, and therefore would have no significantly harmful impacts on the outlook of the rear facing windows.

60 Due to the separation distance, and the sloping roof away from the boundary with No.44, together with the southerly orientation of the gardens, there would not likely be any significant impact on daylight and sunlight to their garden or internally. 45 degree tests taken from the approximate position of existing windows provides further evidence that the impacts to No.44 would not be harmful.

61 *Horniman Drive Properties:* The extension would be at least 3.4m from the rear boundaries of the properties adjoining on Horniman Drive, and over 20m from their rear elevations. It is also noted that those properties are at a significantly higher level than

the proposed extension. There would therefore be no significant impact on the residential amenity of these properties.

### **Privacy**

62 *Neighbouring residential properties:* The proposed windows in the side elevation would be high level and obscure glazed, and this would be secured by planning condition.

63 The additional proposed glazed doors in the rear elevation would have a similar impact on privacy to existing ground floor windows and doors, so no objections are raised.

64 In conclusion the proposal would not have a negative impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

### **Impacts on neighbours conclusion**

65 For the reasons as stated above, no undue loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy are considered to be generated upon any neighbour as a result of the proposal. The amenity impacts to adjoining occupiers is therefore considered to be acceptable.

## **9 TRANSPORT IMPACTS**

### *General Policy*

66 The application site is relatively well connected to the wider public transport network with a PTAL rating of 3. It is approximately a 0.6 miles to the nearest train station, and a five-minute walk to the nearest bus stop.

### *Car Parking*

67 There is an existing off street parking space and crossover on site, and no change is proposed to this, therefore there would be no material impacts.

### *Cycle Parking & Refuse Storage*

68 A cycle and refuse store is proposed in the front garden. As this is an application for works to an existing dwelling there is no requirement to provide cycle parking or refuse storage facilities, but the provision is welcome. The details are proposed to be secured by condition.

## **10 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

69 The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The NPPF requires planning policies to be consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards.

70 London Plan and Core Strategy Policies advocate the need for sustainable development. All new development should address climate change and reduce carbon emissions.

71 For schemes of this scale, sustainability requirements have been absorbed into Building Regulations meaning the applicant does not have to comply with any particular sustainability requirements at this stage of the development process.

## 11 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

72 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:

- 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
- sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

73 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.

74 The CIL is therefore a material consideration.

75 This application would not be charged CIL payments, as the extension is less than 100m<sup>2</sup>.

## 12 EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

76 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

77 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

78 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

79 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/technical-guidance-public-sector-equality-duty-england> and <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/services-public-functions-and-associations-statutory-code-practice>

- 80 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
- The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
  - Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
  - Engagement and the equality duty
  - Equality objectives and the equality duty
  - Equality information and the equality duty

81 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty-guidance>

82 The planning issues set out above do not include any factors that relate specifically to any of the equalities categories set out in the Act, and therefore it has been concluded that there is no impact on equality.

### 13 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

83 In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 prohibits authorities (including the Council as local planning authority) from acting in a way which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. "Convention" here means the European Convention on Human Rights, certain parts of which were incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998. Various Convention rights are likely to be relevant including:

- Article 8: Respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence
- Protocol 1, Article 1: Right to peaceful enjoyment of your property

84 This report has outlined the consultation that has been undertaken on the planning application and the opportunities for people to make representations to the Council as Local Planning Authority.

85 This application has the legitimate aim of the construction of a single storey extension. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence and the freedom to enjoy one's home are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

86 Members need to satisfy themselves that the potential adverse amenity impacts are acceptable and that any potential interference with the above Convention Rights will be legitimate and justified. Both public and private interests are to be taken into account in the exercise of the Local Planning Authority's powers and duties. Any interference with a Convention right must be necessary and proportionate. Members must therefore, carefully consider the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest.

## 14 CONCLUSION

87 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.

88 Officer's consider the proposed development is acceptable in principle, of no significant harm to the character of the application property or surrounding area, or to residential amenity. The scheme is therefore considered acceptable.

89 The proposed extension is recommended for approval, subject to the conditions below.

## 15 RECOMMENDATION

90 That the Committee resolve to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions and informative:

### 15.1 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:

1149/EX-01 Rev A; 1149/EX-02 Rev A; 1149/EX-03; 1149/PL-01 Rev A; 1149/PL-02 Rev A; Site Location

**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 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the new window to be installed in the side elevation of the extension hereby approved shall be fitted as obscure glazed and fixed shut (up to 1.7m above ground floor level) and retained in perpetuity.

**Reason:** To avoid the direct overlooking of adjoining properties and consequent loss of privacy thereto and to comply with DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

4. Prior to installation, details of the proposal for the storage of refuse and recycling facilities must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

**Reason:** In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the provisions for recycling facilities and refuse storage in the interest of safeguarding the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the area in general, in compliance with Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character and Core Strategy Policy 13 Addressing Lewisham waste management requirements (2011).

5. Prior to its installation, full details of the cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

**Reason:** In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (2011).

#### **Informatives**

- A. **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.