# PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 13 OCTOBER 2016

Item No:

APPLICATION NO. DATE VALID

16/P1897 01/07/2016

Address/Site 19 Willmore End, South Wimbledon, London SW19 3DE

(Ward) Abbey

**Proposal:** Erection of a two storey side extension, extending beyond front

wall of dwellinghouse.

**Drawing Nos** Site location map, 170316/2, 16088.03 rev B, MWA TPP 001

**Contact Officer:** Arome Agamah (8545 3116)

#### **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- No
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted 3
- 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 received.

#### 2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is a two storey, two bedroom semi-detached property, located in Willmore End in South Wimbledon. The street is a cul-de-sac linked to Morden Road by Nursery Road and Parkleigh Road. The side/rear boundary directly adjoins the Nursery Road Playing Fields.
- 2.2 Willmore Road is made up of mainly terraced properties grouped around garage courts. There are a few design variations but the houses are all of a similar architectural design and were constructed at the same time in the mid twentieth century.
- 2.3 A lime tree adjoins the side boundary, sited within the playing fields. The application site is not within a conservation area and is not affected by a Tree preservation order.

#### 3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The current application is for the erection of a two storey side extension, comprising a sitting room and utility room at ground floor and a bedroom with ensuite bathroom at first floor level.
- 3.2 The plan has a chamfered rear corner with an angled wall following the shape of the plot and the boundary with the neighbouring playing fields. The extension would be 4.35m wide at the front, narrowing to 1.94m at the rear. It would have a maximum depth of 7.2m and projects 1.6m beyond the front main wall. There would be a 1m gap between the extension and the property boundary.
- 3.3 The materials and window openings are designed to match the original building.

#### 4. PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 No relevant previous planning history.

#### 5. **CONSULTATION**

5.1 The proposal has been publicised by means of standard site notice procedure and individual letters of notification to adjoining properties.

Six objections were received on the following grounds:

- Forward projection will be imposing on gardens at 21 and 23
- Not in keeping, bad precedent
- Concern about impact from construction works and how access will be obtained
- Adjoining tree may be affected giving rise to subsidence issues if its equilibrium is affected, impact on tree's health
- Concern about impact of construction of extension on adjoining property
- Concern about overlooking
- Inappropriate scale for the terrace

- More people will exacerbate existing parking, congestion, sewage and refuse collection issues
- Increased pressure on services e.g. garbage collection and infrastructure

# 5.2 Tree & Landscape Officer:

Following a consultation with the Greenspaces Team, they are satisfied that the impact is acceptable provided that the Lime tree is protected in accordance with the arboricultural impact assessment and method statement provided by the applicant.

### 6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

- 6.1 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)
  CS14 (Design)
- 6.2 <u>Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)</u>

DM D2 (Design Considerations in all developments), DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings) and DM O2 (Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features).

#### 7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The principal planning considerations related to this application are design, impact on neighbouring amenity and the impact on the nearby mature tree.

### 7.2 Design

The proposed extension has been designed to reflect the architectural style and materials of the existing house and surrounding properties. Although one of a pair and projecting forward of the front wall, this reflects the stepping forward of a number of properties in the vicinity, albeit within terraced forms. Within the context of the modern architectural style and the surrounding house layout, the siting is considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing property and buildings in the surrounding area. The splay along the boundary will be at the rear. It is not considered to set a precedent due to the unique configuration of the plot. The design is considered to be acceptable and is does not overly impose within the streetscene.

#### 7.2 Impact on Neighbour Amenity

The bulk of the extension sits between the existing wall of the main house and the boundary with the playing fields and does not therefore directly impact on neighbours. It faces towards the blank flank wall of 21 Willmore End at the front. There is therefore considered to be no direct impact on any nearby property in terms of bulk, massing and outlook.

The rear first floor window is to a bathroom, only overlooks the playing fields, and would be obscure glazed. The front bedroom window would look principally towards the blank flank wall of no.21 with only very oblique views

towards rear gardens. There is not considered to be any unacceptable overlooking or impact on privacy.

# 7.3 Parking/Highways

With respect to concerns about increased pressure on parking provision, the proposal increase the house from 2 to 3-bedroom, does not remove any existing parking and is considered to have an insignificant impact on parking demand, insufficient to warrant refusal. The site location has an PTAL rating of 3.

7.4 The house is connected to the road by a pedestrian pathway. Although this may mean that deliveries and arrival of machinery in relation to construction may require more thought, it would not be a ground to refuse permission. A parking and delivery management plan would be sought.

#### 7.5 Tree Protection Issues

The mature Lime tree on the playing fields sits very close to the boundary. The extension would fall partly within the Root protection Area. The Council's Trees and Parks officers have reviewed and are happy with the Arboricultural Method Statement and structural engineering drawings depicting a foundation design and piling methodology. These were sought prior to approval in order to impose safeguards for the wellbeing of the tree due to its age and its value as a community asset.

# 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 It is considered that the proposed extension is of an acceptable design and would not have a negative impact on the appearance of the surrounding area or upon neighbour amenity. The impact on the adjoining tree has been carefully considered and suitable conditions will be imposed to protect its health.

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION**

and subject to the following conditions:-

- 1. A.1 <u>Commencement of Development</u>
- 2. A.7 Approved Plans

- 3. B.3 (External Materials as Specified)
- 4. F5. (Tree Protection)
- 5. F6. <u>Design of Foundations (insert)</u>

<u>Click here</u> for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load

