

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

**Application No :** 15/00990/FULL1

**Ward:**  
**Crystal Palace**

**Address :** 3 Anerley Park Road Penge London  
SE20 8BZ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 534550 N: 170319

**Applicant :** Mr Alan Coates

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Single story rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds Aldersmead Road  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds  
Smoke Control SCA 6

**Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension which extends into the rear garden of the property. The proposal includes; a new kitchen; dining room; extra bedroom and an outdoor patio area.

**Location**

The application site is a ground floor flat of a pair of semi-detached townhouses located on the south-western side of Anerley Park Road, Anerley.

**Comments from Local Residents**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and one letter of representation was received which can be summarised as follows:-

- Concerns about builders, dust, noise, power tools and radio's

**Comments from Consultees**

Highways

The proposal is located in an area with high PTAL rate of 4.

No car parking is provided, the site is considered accessible to public transport links, being within walking distance of bus routes and a Rail Station.

As there is a correlation of car ownership and type of dwelling people reside, this suggests that not all occupiers will own car(s). Furthermore I am of the opinion that the development would not have a significant impact on the parking in the surrounding road network. Therefore I raise no objection to the proposal.

Drainage Officer - no objection.

Thames Water - 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.

Environmental Health Officer (Housing) -

1. All partitions separating occupancies should be half-hour fire resisting to BS 476.
2. The bathroom and shower room do not appear to be provided with natural ventilation. Adequate means of mechanical ventilation should therefore be provided. I assume that Building Control would wish to comment on this matter.
3. The front bedrooms are effectively accessed via the kitchen/living/ study area. This is an unsatisfactory layout with regard to fire safety unless the bedrooms are provided with a secondary means of escape, such as an escape window. Alternatively, the unit should allow travel from the bedrooms to a final exit without passing through another risk room/area(s).

## **Planning Considerations**

UDP Policies:

- BE1 Design of New Development
- H8 Residential Extensions
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road Safety

London Plan:

- 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
- 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
- 3.8 Housing Choice
- 3.9 Mixed and Balanced Communities
- 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities

- 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

The National Planning Policy Framework, with which the above policies are considered to be in accordance.

## **Planning History**

There is no planning history associated with the site.

## **Conclusions**

### Design and character

The rear extension will extend to 14m in depth along the western boundary of the property to accommodate a new kitchen, family dining room, guest bedroom and a second bathroom. All rooms will have direct access to the garden which includes a patio area.

The extension will be clad in brickwork to match the existing host dwelling and surrounding dwellings. The eastern and southern facades will be punctured with windows to allow natural light into each of the rooms as well direct access to views of the garden.

The existing kitchen will be relocated to form a glazed link between the existing house and new buildings.

The Council's SPG 2 states in paragraph 2.2 that extensions should be designed in order to remain subservient to the main building and extensions should respect the form of the host property without overwhelming the original design. The size of the proposed extension at 14m deep is considered particularly deep and not subservient to the main house.

Architecturally the building has been designed with a transparent connection to the new building connecting the existing flat through to the new extension. The main adjustment to the façade is to replace the existing kitchen window with a doorway leading from the existing house into the extension.

It is clear there is a general uniformity along the road with this particular row of properties 1-9 being similar in appearance to both the front and rear. There are no other rear extensions within the vicinity.

### Impact to nearby residents

One neighbour located at the adjoining semi-detached property has raised concerns about dust and noise in light of the household containing a resident who is in ill-health.

The main impact will be to the neighbours above the ground floor flat of No.3 and the neighbours located at No.1 & No.5. All of the neighbours will be able to see the proposed development from their rear windows, which will occupy a large area of the garden. Concern is raised that neighbours would be able to look into the extension from the upper floors and privacy and overlooking is considered an issue in light of the end part of the extension being a bedroom.

The extension will project 1.3m above the shared boundary fence with No.5 and the brickwork will be clearly visible from the rear garden of No.5. Whilst the roof is proposed to be screened with a mixture of wild flowers and grasses to soften the appearance of the structure the impact to the neighbours is considered to be bulky and overbearing to their outlook.

Members will need to carefully consider whether the introduction of a rear extension with a modern 'green garden pavilion roof' with the dimensions proposed would set a precedent for the surrounding vicinity.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref. 15/00990 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

#### **RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed extension would, by reason of its cumulative size, width and depth be overly dominant and detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties and the appearance of the host dwelling and thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.