

Application No : 15/01267/FULL6

Ward:
Crystal Palace

Address : 59 Anerley Park Penge London SE20
8NU

OS Grid Ref: E: 534813 N: 170448

Applicant : Mrs Tara Coley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey side/rear extension with roof lights and elevational alterations including juliet balcony

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

Proposal

It is proposed to erect a flat-roofed single storey extension at the side/rear. The property has an existing original two storey rear projection which is identical to that at the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. The proposed extension would project by 3m beyond the existing rear wall of the dwelling where it adjoins No. 61. The boundary line is set at an angle and accordingly the flank wall adjacent to No. 61 would slightly encroach over the boundary (Certificate B completed).

The extension would be 8.25m wide at the rear, and would project from the main flank elevation towards the boundary with Ravenswood Court by approx. 3.85m. A side space of 1m would be retained to the boundary with Ravenswood Court and no flank windows are proposed.

The front, side and main rear walls would be constructed of London stock bricks to match the existing, with large sliding doors set into the rear elevation.

The extension would be 3m high and the roof would incorporate a substantial area of structural glazing. The plans additionally show the installation of a Juliet balcony with French doors to the first floor.

Location

The host dwelling is a Victorian semi-detached house which lies on the north-western side of Anerley Park. It lies to the southwest of the other half of the pair of semi-detached houses (No. 61) and to the northeast of a block of maisonettes known as Ravenswood Court. Of that block, Nos. 5 and 5 Ravenswood Close lie on the other side of the boundary. The flats incorporate flank fenestration in addition to a large first floor rear facing window and ground floor patio doors.

The distance between the existing main flank wall of No. 59 and the maisonettes adjacent is approx. 8m at the front, reducing to 6m at the rear. Sited in between the flank walls is a modest detached garage associated with Ravenswood Court.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- o The plans are inaccurate
- o The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site, out of character with the surrounding landscape
- o The extensions would be too close to the flank facing windows at Nos. 5 & 6 Ravenswood Court and would result in a tunnelling effect, loss of light and outlook
- o Loss of privacy
- o Materials would not be in keeping with the existing building

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions

The following Council adopted SPG guidance is also a consideration:

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 General Design Guidance
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 Residential Design Principles

The above policies are considered consistent with the objectives and principles of the NPPF. Policies within the London Plan are also a consideration.

Planning History

There is no recent planning history although in 2006 planning permission was refused for the erection of a new self-contained part one/two storey detached dwelling in between the host dwelling and the maisonettes at Ravenswood Court

(ref. 06/03256). Planning permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal would have constituted an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the amenities of neighbouring properties and resulting in loss of privacy. The proposed house aligned at the front and rear with the existing dwellings on either side, and was sited immediately adjacent to the boundary with Ravenswood Court.

Conclusions

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the proposal are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

The application site was visited by the case officer and the aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

The extension would encroach on the existing side garden area behind the garage associated with Ravenswood Court. As such it would be partially visible from the street frontage, albeit mostly obscured from view by the existing detached garage. The proposed extension would consequently have a limited visual impact on the street scene. Constructed of bricks to match the existing host dwelling, while the extension would have a flat-roofed appearance from the front, the impact of the extension in this respect would not be sufficiently adverse as to render the proposals unacceptable.

With regards to the impact of the proposals on residential amenity, the adjacent ground floor flat has a clear-glazed flank kitchen window, and large patio doors at the rear of the building. The flank window is reported to be the primary light source to a flank facing room. As a consequence, it is necessary to carefully consider the impact of the proposal on the amenities of this property.

The extensions are set away from the south-western flank boundary by 1m and the adjacent flats are themselves set away from the boundary by a similar distance. In addition, the retention of a courtyard area between the front wall of the extension and the rear elevation of the shed would mitigate to some extent the visual impact that the proposal would have when viewed from the side of adjacent property. While the extension would project towards the flank boundary with Nos. 5 and 6 Ravenswood Court, the retention of space around the building and the 3m flat-roof height is considered, in conjunction with the orientation of the dwellings in relation to each other, to sufficiently limit the impact of the proposal in terms of loss of light and prospect to the adjacent flats.

The adjacent flank window to the ground floor flat is set at a reasonably high position in the wall and the floor level in the adjacent ground floor flat appears higher than that in the host dwelling. It would not be uncommon for the boundary

between the properties to be marked by a 2m high fence or wall. The existing trellis-topped wall is reasonably high, and the window sits above the fence height. On balance it is considered that the flat-roofed extension would not have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjacent properties, when taking into account the height of average garden boundary treatments, the position of the window and the retention of a small open area between the front elevation of the side extension and the rear elevation of the garage.

The rearward projection of the proposed extension is not considered excessive in the context of the site and surrounding property and would enable the retention of a reasonable-sized rear garden. While it is noted that the adjacent flats currently have views over the boundary into the rear garden of the host dwelling, the loss of a view is not in itself a material planning consideration, although loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight would constitute material planning considerations to be taken into account in the determination of this application.

While permission was refused in the past for a detached one/two storey dwelling between No. 59 and Ravenswood Court, the application in that case proposed development significantly closer to the boundary of the site with Ravenswood Court, and with a generally more bulky and cramped appearance, as well as providing self-contained residential accommodation rather than an extension. The proximity and height of the proposed dwelling was specifically referred to in ground 3 of the refusal. The height of the proposed dwelling was greater than that currently proposed and the new house was proposed to be sited adjacent to the boundary. It is not considered that the refusal of planning permission in 2006 undermines the potential for the residential extension of the existing dwelling.

The concerns of neighbouring residents are acknowledged; however, it is not considered on balance that the application proposal would have a seriously detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring property, nor on the visual amenities of the street scene. While the extension would have a reasonably large floor area and a flat-roofed appearance, its height, rearward and flank projection in relation to the boundary would not be excessive and the use of matching brickwork on the walls would soften the visual impact of the proposals.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents or impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

as amended by documents received on 13.04.2015 27.04.2015
RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 1ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs |
| ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2ACC04 | Matching materials |
| ACC04R | Reason C04 |
| 3ACK01 | Compliance with submitted plan |

ACK05R K05 reason

4 The flat roof area of the single storey rear extension shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of adjacent properties.