

## **Design + Access Statement**

for a planning application for

**adding a single storey side extension, first floor rear extension, bin store, replacing one garden shed with two, widening existing dropped kerb, recovering existing drive, and internal alterations and changes to fenestration @**

9 Frank Dixon Close, London, SE21 7BD

**Document No. 1**

22.01.24



Photograph Of House from Frank Dixon Way

## **Site Location and Description**

This application site is a two storey, semi-detached, dwellinghouse, located on the eastern side of Frank Dixon Close, a cul-de-sac in a residential area. The site has a large front garden, with off street parking. and large rear garden, that borders Dulwich Park.

The application site is located in the Dulwich Wood Conservation Area, but is not a listed building.

**IANUPTONARCHITECTSLIMITED THEWHITEHOUSEBONNINGTONKENTTN257BP**  
COMPANYNo. **9342173** REGISTERED IN ENGLAND & WALES WEB: **ianuptonarchitectslimited.com**  
EMAIL:- **ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com** MOB:- **07968563892** TEL NO:- **07968563892**





Photograph Of House from Frank Dixon Way

### Planning History

- Ref. No: 06/AP/1329 | Received: Thu 06 Jul 2006 | Validated: Fri 28 Jul 2006 | Status: Refused - Erection of a single storey extension to rear, sides and front of existing dwellinghouse.
- Ref. No: 06/AP/2344 | Received: Mon 04 Dec 2006 | Validated: Thu 14 Dec 2006 | Status: Granted - Erection of a single storey extension to rear of the house and lengthening of porch roof to front elevation, to provide additional residential accommodation.
- Ref. No: 22/AP/1969 | Received: Wed 01 Jun 2022 | Validated: Fri 10 Jun 2022 | Status: Granted - Changing an existing window, to a window and door

### Details of Proposal

The proposals comprise adding a single storey side extension, first floor rear extension, bin store, replacing one garden shed with two, widening existing dropped kerb, recovering existing drive, and internal alterations and changes to fenestration.

**IANUPTONARCHITECTSLIMITED THEWHITEHOUSEBONNINGTONKENTTN257BP**  
COMPANY No. **9342173** REGISTERED IN ENGLAND & WALES WEB: [ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](http://ianuptonarchitectslimited.com)  
EMAIL:- [ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](mailto:ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com) MOB:- **07968563892** TEL NO:- **07968563892**

The single storey side extension is to provide a Utility Room and Larder adjacent to the Kitchen, rather than on the other side of the house.

The first floor rear extension is to increase the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4 and add an ensuite and a dressing room.

The two garden sheds are one to accommodate bicycles, one to accommodate garden equipment, e.g. lawnmowers etc.

Widening the dropped kerb is to make the dropped kerb the same width as the existing drive to facilitate access.



Photograph Of House from back garden

## Planning Policy

As set out in the London Borough of Southwark's

**2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011)**

**IANUPTONARCHITECTSLIMITED THEWHITEHOUSEBONNINGTONKENTTN257BP**  
COMPANYNo. **9342173** REGISTERED IN ENGLAND & WALES WEB: **ianuptonarchitectslimited.com**  
EMAIL:- **ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com** MOB:- **07968563892** TEL NO:- **07968563892**



### 3.4 Extensions to existing residential dwellings

#### Outdoor amenity space

- Any extension should not reduce the outdoor amenity space associated with the dwelling to less than half of its original size, and the remaining amenity space must be at least the minimum standards set out in sections 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 – This proposal would reduce the area of outdoor amenity space by 19 sqm, considerably less than half its original size. Section 3.1 requires 'A minimum of 50 sqm private garden space. The garden should be at least 10m in length'. The proposed development would provide 293 sqm of private garden space (i.e. the back garden), and the back garden would be a minimum of 12 metres in length, so more than the minimum standard set out in Section 3.1.
- Extensions should not adversely affect the privacy or amenity of neighbours and adjoining occupiers – This proposal 'passes' the 'daylight and sunlight tests on the impact of the new development on neighbouring properties as the roof extension is a minimum of 5 metres from the side boundaries, and the side extension is both 1.2 metres away from, and facing a similar side extension on the neighbouring property, number 10 Frank Dixon Close.

#### Design and appearance

All extensions should:

- Harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building – The original building was quite small in scale, please see photograph below taken in 1966:-



IANUPTONARCHITECTSLIMITED THEWHITEHOUSEBONNINGTONKENTTN257BP  
COMPANYNo.9342173REGISTEREDINENGLAND&WALES WEB:[ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](http://ianuptonarchitectslimited.com)  
EMAIL:- [ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](mailto:ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com) MOB:- 07968563892 TEL NO:- 07968563892

Since when, a series of single storey extensions were added. This proposal seeks to maintain the scale of the original building by ensuring that the form of the original dwelling is still apparent, as the proposed extensions are clearly subservient, please see image below:-



Proposed Front Elevation

This proposal also uses the same architectural style of the original building, red pantile roof tiles, white timber windows and white rendered walls, so that it harmonises with the original house.

- Harmonise with the character of the area, including respecting the historic pattern of the surrounding area – The character and historic pattern of the surrounding area is one of ongoing change. Every house on Frank Dixon Close has, since 1987, either been completely replaced, or significantly extended:-

- 1 Frank Dixon Close – Replacement dwelling - 87/AP/1312
- 2 Frank Dixon Close– Single storey rear extensions - 06/AP/1811
- 3 Frank Dixon Close – Replacement dwelling - 17/AP/2369
- 4 Frank Dixon Close – Replacement dwelling - 21/AP/0757
- 5 Frank Dixon Close– Single storey rear extensions - 10/AP/1007
- 6 Frank Dixon Close – Single storey side and rear, two storey side and three storey front extension - 16/AP/5147
- 7 Frank Dixon Close – Two storey extensions - 05/AP/2032
- 8 Frank Dixon Close - Two storey rear extension - 11/AP/1557
- 10 Frank Dixon Close - Two storey side and rear extension - 01/AP/0236

Many have even had side extensions built that almost attach what were detached dwellings.

**IANUPTONARCHITECTSLIMITED THEWHITEHOUSEBONNINGTONKENTTN257BP**  
COMPANYNo. **9342173** REGISTERED IN ENGLAND & WALES WEB: [ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](http://ianuptonarchitectslimited.com)  
EMAIL:- [ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](mailto:ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com) MOB:- **07968563892** TEL NO:- **07968563892**

This proposal to extend would harmonise with the character of the area, which is small dwellings, either significantly extended, or replaced with larger dwellings.

- Be successfully integrated with their surroundings. The extension should read as if it were part of the original dwelling. Where a different approach is taken, the design and composition should be successful. It should retain or restore existing features that are important elements in the townscape or that contribute to the architectural integrity of proportions of a building or group of buildings – This proposal looks far more as if it was a part of the original dwelling than that which it replaces, please see below:-



Side View Existing



Side View Proposed



- Not unacceptably affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight – This proposal 'passes' the 'daylight and sunlight tests on the impact of the new development on neighbouring properties as the roof extension is a minimum of 5 metres from the side boundaries, and the side extension is both 1.2 metres away from, and facing a similar side extension on the neighbouring property, number 10 Frank Dixon Close. This is illustrated in the images below:-



Rear View Existing



Rear View Proposed

- Not be of a size or scale that would visually dominate neighbouring properties – As there is already a side extension on the South side, and as the proposed roof extension is to the rear, when viewed from the street, this size and scale of this proposal would not be visually dominant, in fact the only thing that would be noticeable from the street is the loss of the rather odd chimney that projects awkwardly from the ridge. Removing this chimney allows the house to follow the character of the area, which is chimneys at the side of the houses, please see images below:-

**IANUPTONARCHITECTSLIMITED THEWHITEHOUSEBONNINGTONKENTTN257BP**  
COMPANYNo. **9342173** REGISTERED IN ENGLAND & WALES WEB: [ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](http://ianuptonarchitectslimited.com)  
EMAIL:- [ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com](mailto:ian@ianuptonarchitectslimited.com) MOB:- **07968563892** TEL NO:- **07968563892**



Street View Existing



Street View Proposed

- Be subordinate to the original building. The extension should play a “supporting role” to the original dwelling in terms of location, form and scale. Any extension should not dominate the original building and should be set back from the principal elevations – This proposal is sub-ordinate to the original building as the ridge height and eaves of the roof extension are 0.64 metres lower than the original roof, and the side extension is single storey. To achieve the requirement set out above that ‘the extension should read as if it were part of the original dwelling’ the walls to these extensions are not set back from, but line up with the original walls.
- Not compromise any rooms in the existing house. No habitable room should become completely internal without a window - The only inhabitable room without a window is the ground floor study but, this room did benefit from light and views out to the back garden through the Living Area, and this proposal will not a change this existing provision.
- Use materials that match those in the original house and the surrounding areas. Windows and doors should be of a similar pattern and align with existing windows and door openings where possible – The materials proposed, red pantiles, rendered walls and white painted windows would exactly match the existing house, and many of the houses in the surrounding area.



## Rear extensions

They should:

- Generally, for most smaller terraced and semi-detached houses, be limited to a single-storey in height and must respect existing building heights – This house is not a smaller terraced, or semi-detached house
- The eave level and ridge level must be no higher than the highest part of the roof – The eave level would be the same as the existing eave level of the main roof, and the ridge level would be lower than that of the existing main roof ridge height
- 3 metres is usually the maximum depth that can be added without harm to neighbours and preventing a feeling of enclosure – This proposal adds a depth of 5.3 metres as, the house is sufficiently distant from the neighbours that it will cause no harm to them and, as there is already a single storey extension of this depth so, going out as far as the existing single storey extension allows the extension to read as if it were part of the original dwelling.
- Should not exceed 3 metres in height to prevent a feeling of enclosure – This proposal is 3.7 metres high, if you include the highest point on the roof, if you measure to top of existing wall, to top of new wall, it is only 1.7 metres high
- Respect the design and windows features of the host building – The new windows are of the same proportions and style as many of those in the existing house, although the existing house does have windows of many styles.

## Side extensions

Side extensions should:

- Be subsidiary to the main building – The proposed side extension is single storey, 2.8 metres high, and so would be subservient to the existing main building which is two storey, with a pitched roof, and 8.1 metres high.
- If the side extension is proposed to be more than single storey, the upper floor should be set back from the side building line – The proposed side extension is only single storey.
- Have roofs that match those of existing buildings in terms of roof shapes and pitches – The proposed single storey extension would have the same roof shape, and pitch, as the existing single storey extension to which it would be attached.
- Avoid the infilling of gaps between properties, where this is an important townscape feature – The proposed single storey extension would be at least 1.2 metres from the boundary, as is the existing single storey extension to which it would be attached, and so would not create the sense of a further infilling of the gap between properties

## Roof extensions

Roof extensions will not be permitted in the following circumstances:

- Where additional floors in any form would harm the architectural integrity of a building or the unity of a group – This proposal would not impact on the architectural integrity of the house when viewed from the front as the roof extension would not be visible. This proposal would enhance the architectural integrity of the house when

viewed from the rear as it would 'read as if it were part of the original dwelling'. This proposal would not harm the unity of the group as all the houses on Frank Dixon Close are quite different and distinct.

- Where roof extensions cut through ridge or hip lines – This proposal does not require cutting through ridge or hip lines.
- On buildings which are the same height or significantly higher than their neighbours, especially those which have been extended in the past – This proposal will not increase the height of the existing building.
- On buildings and in terraces which are completed compositions or which have existing mansards or roof storeys – This house has neither an existing mansard or roof storey
- Where the varied skyline of a terrace or group of buildings is of interest and should be maintained – The skyline of the houses on Frank Dixon Close could hardly be described as of interest and in need of protection.
- Where the building has roofline features which were designed to be seen against the sky – This proposal would not significantly impact the roofline when viewed from the front and rear and, as regards the roofline from the sides, this is largely hidden by the neighbouring houses.
- Where it would unbalance the proportions of the building – This proposal would not unbalance the proportions of the existing building as all extensions are pretty symmetrical
- Where there is an unbroken run of butterfly roofs – There are no butterfly roofs on this site
- Where the roofline is exposed to long views from public spaces and a roof extension in any form would have a detrimental impact on that view – There are no long views from public spaces that the roofline of this proposal would impact
- Where important historic roof forms would be lost – The historic roof form of the original house would not be impacted by this proposal
- No roof extensions above the height of the ridge of the main roof – This proposal does not include roof extensions which would extend above the height of the ridge of the original main roof

Roof extensions and alterations should:

- Be pitched rather than flat as they are more efficient with rainwater and usually easier to integrate its design – The first floor roof extension in this proposal will be pitched, as the existing first floor roof.
- Be similar to that on adjoining properties – The proposed roof extension will be pitched, as the roofs to the first floors of the adjoining properties
- Preserve the characteristic features of the roof such as chimney stacks and chimney pots – One of the existing chimney stacks will be retained to preserve this characteristic feature, the other rather odd chimney that projects awkwardly from the ridge, would be removed as it is unsightly, and removing it allows the house to follow the character of the area, which is chimneys on the ends.
- Preserve the external expression of party and rear walls and variations of roof line and pitch – There are no party walls, and the external expression of the rear wall is preserved by keeping the original roof and making the roof to the rear roof extension lower.



- Roof lights set into the roof slope are favoured over dormer windows where possible – This proposal does not include any dormer windows.
- Roof lights should be fitted flush (parallel) with the roof to avoid clutter on the front of the building – This proposal does not include any roof lights on the front of the building
- There should be a maximum of two roof lights to front roof slope – This proposal does not include any roof lights on the front of the building
- In conservation areas, roof lights need to be in keeping with the style of the conservation area and be flush with the roof plan – The rooflights in this proposal will not be visible except from the air.

## Supporting Documentation

- 1 Design and Access Statement
  - 2 Heritage Statement
  - 3 Parking Provision Statement
  - 4 Fire Safety Strategy/Reasonable Exception Statement
  - 5 Location Plan
  - 6 Site Block Plan Existing
  - 7 Ground Floor Plan Existing
  - 8 First Floor Plan Existing
  - 9 Roof Plan Existing
  - 10 Elevations Existing
  - 11 Elevations Existing
  - 12 Shed Existing
  - 13 Site Block Plan Proposed
  - 14 Ground Floor Plan Proposed
  - 15 First Floor Plan Proposed
  - 16 Roof Plan Proposed
  - 17 Elevations Proposed
  - 18 Elevations Proposed
  - 19 Shed Proposed
- CIL Form 1 Additional Questions

## **Heritage Statement**

for a planning application for

**adding a single storey side extension, first floor rear extension, bin store, replacing one garden shed with two, widening existing dropped kerb, recovering existing drive, and internal alterations and changes to fenestration @**

9 Frank Dixon Close, London, SE21 7BD

**Document No. 2**

22.01.24

The development site is a detached dwelling within both the Dulwich Estate, and the Dulwich Wood Conservation Area.

The Dulwich Wood Conservation Area does not have an adopted conservation area appraisal but, information about the designation of the conservation area is available on the council's dedicated web-page:

*'The Dulwich Wood Conservation Area is located to the southeast of Dulwich Village, and its woods and commons make up the largest expanse of predominantly open space in the borough. The conservation area is bounded by College Road, Sydenham Hill, Lordship Lane and Court Lane, and as well as parkland, the area includes playing fields, allotments, and a golf course. To the north, the formal grounds of Dulwich Park are separated from Dulwich Common by the South Circular. Buildings in the conservation area tend to be around the perimeters of the open space, including some good quality Victorian houses in substantial grounds, although much has been demolished to make way for a number of 20th century residential estates. Some of these, which were built in the 1960s or 1970s, are of some merit in their own right with attractively landscaped gardens, mature trees, and a cohesive architectural form.'*

According to the Dulwich Estate website:-

*'The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act required the Estate to prepare a 'Dulwich Development Plan' and ... the Estate set up a joint venture with Wates, a large house builder, and between 1957 and the late 1960s over 2000 new homes were built. Designed by the Estate's architects, Austin Vernon & Partners, they set a high architectural standard'.*

as you can see from the photograph below, taken in 1966:-





The development site is on Frank Dixon Close which, as it a cul-de-sac, was probably constructed in the 1950's as cul-de-sacs, that is to say dead end residential roads, did not exist much before this, as they are a later C20th innovation.

As for the other houses on Frank Dixon Close, of which there are 9, since 1987, planning consent has been granted to demolish and replace 3, and for significant extensions to all the other 6, as set out below:-

- 1 Frank Dixon Close – Replacement dwelling - 87/AP/1312
- 2 Frank Dixon Close– Single storey rear extensions - 06/AP/1811
- 3 Frank Dixon Close – Replacement dwelling - 17/AP/2369
- 4 Frank Dixon Close – Replacement dwelling - 21/AP/0757
- 5 Frank Dixon Close– Single storey rear extensions - 10/AP/1007
- 6 Frank Dixon Close – Single storey side and rear, two storey side and three storey front extension - 16/AP/5147
- 7 Frank Dixon Close – Two storey extensions - 05/AP/2032
- 8 Frank Dixon Close - Two storey rear extension - 11/AP/1557
- 10 Frank Dixon Close - Two storey side and rear extension - 01/AP/0236

This suggests that the individual houses in Frank Dixon Close are not 'of some merit in their own right with attractively landscaped gardens, mature trees, and a cohesive architectural form'.

It would therefore appear that Frank Dixon Close has been included in the Dulwich Wood Conservation Area not because is of its own 'special architectural and historic

interest, because it is surrounded by areas of 'special architectural and historic interest'.

Therefore, provided any development within Frank Dixon Close is so insubstantial so as not to harm the areas of 'special architectural and historic interest' which surround it, and this proposal is suitably insubstantial, there should be no reason why consent should be refused on the grounds that the site is in a conservation area.

Otherwise, as set out in the London Borough of Southwark's

### **2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011)**

Extensions and alterations within conservation areas should:

- Respect the context of the Conservation Area, having regard to the content of Conservation Area Appraisals - There is no adopted conservation area appraisal
- Use high quality materials that complement and enhance the conservation area – The proposal uses the same high quality materials as the existing dwelling
- Not involve the loss of existing traditional features of interest which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area – The proposals for not require the loss of existing traditional features
- Not introduce design details or features that are out of character with the area such as the use of windows and doors made of aluminium, uPVC or any other non-traditional materials – The proposals use traditional design details, features and materials



### **Parking Provision Statement**

for a planning application for

**adding a single storey side extension, first floor rear extension, bin store, replacing one garden shed with two, widening existing dropped kerb, recovering existing drive, and internal alterations and changes to fenestration @**

9 Frank Dixon Close, London, SE21 7BD

**Document No. 3**

22.01.24

### **Car Parking Provision**

The existing drive is 6.7 metres long by 6.0 metres wide and so provides 'off road' parking for two cars which complies with the Southwark Council Residential Parking Standard of '2 maximum spaces per unit'. This provision will be unaffected by this development.

### **Bicycle Parking Provision**

One of the new garden sheds will provide the required number of bicycle parking spaces, '2 spaces per two or more bedroom dwellings'.

**Fire Safety Strategy/Reasonable Exception Statement**

for a planning application for

**adding a single storey side extension, first floor rear extension, bin store, replacing one garden shed with two, widening existing dropped kerb, recovering existing drive, and internal alterations and changes to fenestration @**

9 Frank Dixon Close, London, SE21 7BD

**Document No. 4**

22.01.24

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure and Section 62A Applications) (England) (Amendment) Order 2021, Planning Gateway One requires the submission of a Fire Statement for all development containing 'relevant buildings'. Relevant buildings are buildings that contain two or more dwellings, or educational accommodation, and meet the height condition of 18 metres or more in height, or 7 or more storeys. However, the development site is in a building that is only six storeys high, where the distance measured from the lowest floor level, to the highest floor level, is 16.8 metres, so Planning Gateway One requirements do not apply.

London Plan Policy D12, Fire Safety, requires a fire statement to be submitted for all major development, irrespective of whether it is development to a relevant building. It sets out that, where the applicant considers parts of or all of policy D12A are not relevant, this should be justified in a Reasonable Exception Statement (RES), so please see below:-

A3.4 Form 4 – Reasonable Exception Statement		
Site address	9 Frank Dixon Close, London, SE21 7BD	
Description of development	Single storey side extension, first floor rear extension	
Name of Author and role in the development	Ian Upton - Architect	
Category of development	Expected policy information requirements	
Householder	The current fire safety measures are appropriate and will not be adversely affected by the development	The current fire safety measures are inadequate. There is no protected escape route from the first floor.
	The fire safety measures will be altered	A new protected stair and hall will be provided to create a protected escape route from the first floor. A new escape window will be provided in the ground floor bedroom without an external door. First floor habitable rooms will

		be provided with escape windows. A fire detection and alarm system, will be fitted, to Grade D2 Category LD2 standard in accordance with recommendations of BS 5839-6, as required by Approved Document B – Fire Safety. Carbon Monoxide Alarms will be fitted adjacent to boiler. A new fire door will be fitted in the doorway between the stair and the Kitchen/Living/Dining.
--	--	---