

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
13 OCTOBER 2016**

	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	16/P1318	30/03/2018
Address/Site	20 Belvedere Grove, Wimbledon Village SW19 7RL	
(Ward)	Village	
Proposal:	Erection of rear extensions at ground, first and second floor levels and construction of basement beneath rear extensions.	
Drawing Nos	BG 01F, BG 02F, BG 03 F, BG 04F, BG 05F, BG 06F, BG 08F, BG 10F, BG 11F, BG 12F, Deign and Access Statement, Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report, Construction Method Statement, Hydrology Report, Arboricultural Implications Assessment Report and Method Statement and Site Investigation Report	
Contact Officer:	Richard Allen (8545 3621)	

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: No
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental impact statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice- Yes
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted – 6
- External consultants: None
- Density: n/a
- Number of jobs created: n/a
- Archaeology Priority Zone: No

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 is a two storey detached dwelling house with rooms within the roof space and an integral garage on the south side of Belvedere Grove. In common with most other properties in Belvedere Grove, it was built around the late 19th/early 20th Century. The road is an eclectic mix of styles from this period, some with individually and some similarly designed properties.
- 2.2 The neighbouring houses at 20 and 22 Belvedere Grove are in a grand Queen Anne influenced style whilst the application site house is much more modest in scale and design approach, owing more to the Arts and Crafts movement. The application site falls within Sub Area 4 of the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area and the character assessment recognizes that the property makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. The building has a strong horizontal emphasis reinforced by broad casement windows at each level and by the wide dormer windows on the front and rear roof slope. The property is built in red brick at the ground level rendered and pebble dashed above, with a steeply angled hipped clay tiled roof coming up to a narrow decoratively tiled ridge. There are wide flat roofed dormers on the front and rear roof slope and tall chimney stacks. The building has not been extended and has a large south facing garden.
- 2.3 The topography of the site is relatively flat with a gentle fall towards the rear boundary. There is also a Tree Preservation Order TPO (MER (69)) on a Copper Beech tree within the rear garden.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The current application involves the erection of rear extensions at ground, first and second floor levels, with a basement level beneath. The ground floor rear extension would be 5m deep, extending across the full width of the existing building and would be 3m in height. The first floor element would be 4m deep and inset from the side elevations of the ground floor extension by 1.2 metres on each side. It would have the same 6m eaves height as the original house.
- 3.2 At roof level a new hipped gable would be formed over the first floor extension, extending out from the existing main ridge. It would contain a rear dormer window and a high level roof light on each of the side roof slopes. Within the main roof, new dormers are proposed on each of the side roof slopes and a new roof light above the existing reroofed front dormer.

- 3.3 Two new first floor windows would be formed in the flank of the existing south west facing side wall with 2 additional ground floor windows on the north east side.
- 3.4 A new lead clad porch is proposed on the front elevation and alterations to the first floor window configuration. A sloping roofed extension would replace the existing side staircase structure.
- 3.5 The basement would provide a gym, media room, storage and plant rooms. There would be enlarged main living space at ground floor, the first floor would be reconfigured to provide four bedrooms with bathrooms, together with a further two bedrooms within the roof space.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 14/P2958

In October 2014 planning permission was refused under delegated powers for the erection of rear extensions above a basement at ground floor, first floor and roof levels with side and rear dormer windows. Planning permission was refused on the grounds that:-

1) The proposed extensions would adversely impact on the proportions and form of the original building, in particular the main roof and flank elevations, increasing the bulk of the side elevations, creating a less delicate roof form and diminishing the sense of space around the building, consequently failing to preserve or enhance the character of Sub Area 4 of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area, contrary to policy CS14 Design in the adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policies DM D2 and DM D4 of the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014)

2)The proposed rear extension would be overbearing and oppressive when viewed from the adjacent windows and gardens of 22 and 18 Belvedere Grove contrary to policy DM D2 of the adopted Merton Sites and Polices Plan (2014)'.

- 4.2 The applicant subsequently appealed against the Councils refusal of planning permission on 28 July 2014 (Appeal Ref. APP/T5720/W/15/3014412) with the Planning Inspector dismissing the Appeal on 11 January 2016. In the Appeal decision letter the Planning inspector concluded that *'the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable overbearing effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of either of the adjoining residential properties, the proposal would significantly and detrimentally effect the spaciousness around the property, this spaciousness is part of the defining characteristics and significance of the conservation area which would therefore be harmed. This harm should be given substantial weight and sufficient on its own to justify dismissing the appeal'.*

- 4.3 A copy of the appeal decision letter is appended.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The application has been advertised by conservation area site and press notice procedure and letters of notification to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response 14 objections were received. The comments are set out below:-

- The Planning Inspector found that the earlier proposals (LBM Ref.14/P2958) would significantly and detrimentally affect the spaciousness around the property and that the proposals would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would therefore be contrary to the Council's adopted policies. The reduction in width of the rear extension by 0.7 m on each side does not meet these objections.
- The rearward projection of the extensions would be overbearing and oppressive when viewed from adjacent windows and gardens of 18 and 22 Belvedere Grove.
- The drawings show roof lights facing 22 Belvedere Grove that are not obscure glazed.
- The proposed extensions would result in a reduction of space and loss of light to adjoining houses.
- The extension extends the house considerably and there are concerns regarding the excavation for the basement.
- The substantial size of the extension is entirely out of context with houses nearby.
- The current application adds two new windows on each side of the property making a total of four windows facing number 18 Belvedere Grove, where there are now none and 7 windows facing onto number 22 together with a balcony at third floor level overlooking gardens. Whilst this will affect the immediate neighbours to 20 at 18 and 22, all the nearby houses (including 16) will be materially affected from a privacy point of view.

5.2 Amended Plans

Following discussions with officers the design of the extension was amended so that the first floor section of the extension was 'inset' from the ground floor by 1.2 metres and the flat roofed section of the roof originally proposed replaced by a conventional pitched roof that would align with the existing ridge height. A reconsultation has been undertaken and a further letter of objection has been received. The grounds of objection are set out below:-

- The proposed changes are of a minor nature and do little to address the objections to this and the earlier application.
- The extension is too large.
- The proposed extension is still the same depth that was turned down on appeal. It is visually intrusive and overbearing to 18 Belvedere Grove.
- The scale and mass of the extension would negatively affect 18 Belvedere Grove. All previous extensions in the area have been set off the boundary by 1 metre and the roof lie sloped or even lowered on ground floor extensions to cause minimal disruption to neighbours.

- There are still dormer windows to the side elevations which are out of character with other windows and the dormer windows would result in loss of privacy.
- Despite the amendments the extra bulk of the building would be visible from the street and would significantly affect the spaciousness of the property. This was the primary reason that the Planning Inspector refused the Appeal in 2014.
- The proposed extension does not protect the historic environment and would set a precedent for large unattractive extensions that reduce the spaciousness of the area.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)
CS14 (Design).

6.2 Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)
DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments). DM D3 (Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings), DM D4 (Managing Heritage Assets). Standards) and DM O2 (Nature conservation; Trees, Hedges and Landscape Features).

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

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance Note-Residential Extensions, alterations and Conversions (November 2011) and Wimbledon North Character Assessment Sub Area 'Belvedere' (2007).

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The current application has been submitted following the refusal of planning application LBM Ref.14/P2958 in July 2014 and the subsequent dismissal on Appeal (Appeal Ref.APP/T5720/W/15/3014412). The main planning consideration is whether the changes to the design of the extensions have addressed the Planning Inspector's reasons for dismissing the Appeal, together with design/conservation issues, neighbour amenity, basement construction and parking issues.

7.2 Relationship to Previous Appeal Application/Design and Conservation Area Issues

The previously refused application for extensions at ground first and second floor level which went to appeal was of a greater mass and bulk than the current application. The Planning Inspector considered that the proposed extension would not give rise to an unacceptable overbearing effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of either of the adjoining properties. However, they considered that the depth and bulk of the extensions, which

would be readily seen within the streetscene, would significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness, failing to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

- 7.3 All of the houses on the south side of Belvedere Grove are either locally listed or noted as making a positive contribution to the appearance to Sub Area 4 of the Wimbledon North Conservation Area and the existing roof form of number 20 is clearly visible in the street. The previously refused proposal extended the existing roof planes directly out from the existing ridge line, employing an element of flat roof in order to achieve this. The traditional ridged roof form would have disappeared and the building's proportions would have been significantly changed, clearly visible on the skyline.
- 7.4 In the current proposal, in order to address Merton's and the Planning Inspector's concerns, the first floor of the proposed rear extension has been inset away from each side wall by 1.2m and the proposed flat section of roof removed. It is no longer intended to extend out from each side of the existing ridge, but to form a new gable extending out from the mid-point of the ridge of the main roof. This maintains the delicate main roof form and extends at the rear in a manner that is much more in keeping with the original house design, with more subservience and a much reduced impact on the skyline. As the roof is also inset from the side this reduces the proportion of the extended building that would be visible from the street.
- 7.5 The extensions and dormer windows have also been designed to reflect the character and appearance of the original dwelling house. The proposed new fencing and replacement planting within the front curtilage would also have a positive impact upon the character and appearance of the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area and would comply with the aims of policies CS14 (Design), DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments) and DM D4 (Managing Heritage Assets).
- 7.6 Neighbour Amenity
The proposed extension has been inset at first floor level by 1.2 metres on either side and the volume of the roof form reduced compared to the previous proposal, which the Inspector considered to be acceptable in terms of direct impact on neighbour amenity. The ground floor extension is no greater in depth to that proposed by the previously refused scheme (LBM Ref.14/P2958). On the side elevation adjacent to no 22, the new side windows at ground and first floor level would be obscure glazed, the side dormer at roof level would be obscure glazed, and the rooflight is positioned with a cill height 1.75m above finished floor level. On the side elevation adjacent to no 18, the new first floor windows and roof level side dormer are obscure glazed and the roof light has a cill height 1.75m above finished floor level. A daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report has been submitted which demonstrates that the proposed impact is acceptable in relation to the BRE guidelines. The current application proposes less development than that previously refused, which the Inspector considered would not give rise to unacceptable living conditions for neighbours. The proposed extensions are

therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of policy DM D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments).

7.7 Basement Construction

The proposed basement is relatively small and is located under the footprint of the proposed rear extension. A Construction Method Statement has been submitted, together with site investigation and hydrology report. The provision of basement accommodation is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of policy DM D2 subject to appropriate conditions being imposed on any grant of planning permission.

7.8 Parking

The existing vehicular access would be retained and off street parking provided by a garage with space for a further two vehicles within the front curtilage. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of policy CS20 (Parking).

7.9 Developer Contributions

The proposed development would be subject to payment of the Merton Community Infrastructure Levy and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

8.0 **CONCLUSION**

8.1 The current proposals have addressed the Planning Inspectors reasons for dismissing the Appeal in relation to the previous application LBM Ref.14/P2958 and the design of the extensions is considered to be acceptable and the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area. The design, size and siting of the extensions would also not affect neighbour amenity. 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. B.4 (Site Surface Treatment)
5. B.5 (Boundary Treatment)

6. C.2 (No Permitted Development Doors/Windows)
7. D.11 (Construction Times)
8. H.9 (Construction Vehicles)
9. No development shall commence until a detailed Basement Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The basement shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason for condition: In the interest of neighbour amenity and to comply with policy DM D2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014).
10. Obscure glazing – flank elevation windows
11. 1.75m above FFL – flank rooflights
12. INF.1 (Party Wall Act)

[Click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load