

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
11 February 2016

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
	15/P3993	20/10/2015

Address/Site 5 Peregrine Way, West Wimbledon SW19 4RN

(Ward) Raynes Park

Proposal: Increase in width of access to existing garage, erection of a brick chimney to north side elevation and a brick planter to the front elevation.

Drawing Nos PWW_001, PWW_2000E, 210E, 211B, 212B, 213B and Design and Access and Heritage Statement

Contact Officer: Richard Allen (8545 3621)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: Yes
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental impact statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice- No
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted –
- External consultants: None
- Density: n/a
- Number of jobs created: n/a
- Archaeology Priority Zone: Yes

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application has been brought to the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a detached two storey dwelling house situated on the north east side of Peregrine Way. Peregrine Way is a cul-du-sac accessed from Woodhayes Road. A single storey rear extension has recently been constructed as 'permitted development'. The application site is within the Merton (Wimbledon West) Conservation Area.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The current proposal involves an increase in width of access to the existing garage, erection of a brick chimney to north side elevation and a brick planter to the front elevation of the house. It is proposed to increase the width of the existing garage by 1.1 metres to increase the width of the garage from 2.250 m to 3.350m in order to increase the width of the garage to accommodate larger cars. It is also proposed to bring the front elevation of the garage forward by 1.6 metres to align with the existing porch. A new gable would be formed above the new garage door. It is also proposed to increase the width of the utility room at the rear of the garage by 800mm to align with the new flank wall of the enlarged garage that would abut the boundary with 7 Peregrine Way. It is also proposed to construct a low brick planter in front of the porch and erect a chimney to the (north) side elevation of the house. The alterations and extensions to the property would be undertaken using facing materials to match the existing elevations of the house.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 The application property is part of a development of 15 houses dating from the early 1970's (Ref.83/76).
- 4.2 In December 2010 a Certificate of Lawfulness was issued in respect of a ground floor extension (LBM Ref.10/P3145).
- 4.3 On 16 October 2014 planning permission was refused by the Planning Applications Committee for the erection of a two storey rear extension (LBM Ref.14/P2515). Planning permission was refused on the grounds that:-
- 4.4 The proposal by reason of its height and bulk and mass and design would (a) fail to respect the space between buildings and so adversely affect the open views and spaciousness which characterises the area; and (b) fails to respect and complement the detailing of the original dwelling building and would be contrary to policies DM D2 and DM D3 (particularly para (a) (iv) and para (a) (i) and (ii) of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)'.

4.5 The applicant appealed against the Councils refusal of planning permission and the Planning Inspector dismissed the Appeal on 18 February 2015 (Appeal Ref.APP/T5720/D/14/2229822). The Planning Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed double storey front and side extension at ground and first floor and single storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the estate is characterised by large houses on spacious plots separated from each other by at least the width of an attached single storey garage. The appeal proposal involved a two storey front and side extension that would reduce the sense of spaciousness between buildings.

4.6 7 Peregrine Way

A planning application for a single storey front extension has been submitted for 7 Peregrine Way (LBM Ref.15/P4294). This application is currently undetermined.

5. **CONSULTATION**

5.1 The application has been advertised by Conservation Area site and press notice procedure. In response 8 letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are set out below:-

-Number 5 Peregrine Way has already been extended from its original size and is larger than other houses in Peregrine Way.

-Despite the refusal of planning permission in 2015 a single storey rear extension has recently been constructed.

-The proposal will result in creeping overdevelopment.

-The refused scheme included a large porch extension above the garage and the brick planter could be used to increase the size of the porch at a future date.

-The extended garage would adversely impact on the space between numbers 5 and 7 Peregrine Way.

-The increase in size of the garage would impact upon the streetscene.

-The proposed extension appears higher than the existing garage.

-There is a mature Acer tree and evergreen tree in the front garden to the side of the proposed garage extension. The planned extension could compromise trees.

-The garage extension would extend up to the boundary with 7 Peregrine Way.

-The alterations will result in a building that is out of character with other houses in the street.

-As indicated in the recent Appeal decision the Inspector stated that part of the essential character of the Peregrine Way estate is that of large detached buildings on spacious plots, reinforced by spaces between buildings. The proposed development would compromise the latter feature of the estates character.

5.2 North West Wimbledon Residents Association

The proposal would result in the loss of a 1.3 metre gap between the application property and 7 Peregrine Way and would result in the extension of the side wall to the boundary with 7 Peregrine Way. The proposals conflict with the Planning Inspectors comments in relation to the recent appeal decision. The proposed application shares some aspects of the refused application to which the Inspector refers. Pertinent to the present application is that it does not reduce the space between numbers 5 and 7 Peregrine Way. The proposal would remove the space which would be detrimental to the character of the area.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)
CS14 (Design) and CS20 (Parking)

6.2 Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)
DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments), DM D3 (Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings) and DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards).

6.3 The London Plan (February 2015)
The relevant policies within the London Plan are 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture).

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations concern design/conservation, neighbour amenity and tree issues.

7.2 Design and Conservation Issues

It should be noted that the previous planning application that was refused permission and subsequently dismissed on Appeal proposed a large two storey side, front and rear extension that would have enclosed that gap between properties with the resulting loss of views between buildings and eroding the sense of spaciousness within Peregrine Way. It was the two storey extension that was considered to be unacceptable in design terms and dismissed on Appeal by the planning Inspector. The current proposal involves a single storey side extension to form an enlarged garage, the erection of a chimney stack and brick planter. The proposed extension to the existing garage would be 1 metre in width and the new flank wall of the garage would abut the existing 2.5 metre high brick boundary wall that forms the boundary with 7 Peregrine Way. The garage would also be extended forward of the existing front elevation by 1.7 metres. A gable feature would be constructed above the extended garage and the linked into the existing mono-pitched roof to the front elevation of the building. The flat roof would be constructed over the extended garage behind the front feature gable. At the rear of the garage the existing utility room would be extended up to the side boundary. On the north (side) elevation a chimney would be constructed and low level brick planter provided by the front entrance to the house. The extension would be

constructed in facing materials to match the elevations of the existing building. Given the relatively small scale of the proposed works and the fact that the extension to the existing garage would be single storey, the 'gap' between properties at first floor level would be maintained. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of policies CS14, DM D2 and DM D3.

7.3 Neighbour Amenity

The proposed extension to the existing garage would abut the 2.5 metre high brick boundary wall that forms the boundary between the application site and 7 Peregrine Way. No windows would be formed in the side elevation of the garage extension and there would be no loss of privacy as a result of the proposals. Although a parapet wall (with an overall height of 3 metres) would be formed alongside the boundary with 7 Peregrine Way, the parapet wall would be only 500mm higher than the existing wall that forms the boundary between number 5 and 7 Peregrine Way. It is therefore considered that the current proposals would not affect neighbour amenity and are acceptable in terms of policy DM D2.

7.4 Trees

There is a mature Acer tree and an evergreen tree within the front curtilage of the application property. However, both trees are sited well away from the proposed works and would not be affected by the extension to the garage.

8. **SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

- 8.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly there is no requirement for an EIA submission.

9. **CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The current proposal for a single storey extension to the existing garage, erection of chimney and brick planter to front elevation are acceptable in design terms and the proposal would not affect neighbour amenity. The proposed garage extension would be single storey and the gap between buildings at first floor level would be maintained. The proposal has therefore addressed the previous reasons for refusal and the Planning Inspectors concerns. Accordingly it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

and subject to the following conditions:-

1. A.1 Commencement of Development
2. A.7 Approved Drawings
3. B.1 (Approval of Facing Materials)
4. C.2 (No Permitted Development Doors/Windows)
5. INF.1 Party Wall Act