

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

23 April 2015

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
	15/P0714	23/02/2015

**Address/Site**      **24 Rayleigh Road, Wimbledon, SW19 3RF**

**(Ward)**              **Dundonald**

**Proposal:**            **Erection of new roof to side infill extension, single storey rear extension, erection of a rear roof extension with Juliette balcony and alterations to windows on ground floor flank elevation and front elevation.**

**Drawing Nos:**        **24RR P101, 24RR P102 Rev A, 24RR P103 Rev A, 24RR P104 Rev A, 24RR P105**

**Contact Officer:**    **Jack Appleton (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- Yes
- Site notice-Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted-No
- Number neighbours consulted: 2
- 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 at the request of Councillor Dean and due to the number of objections received .

## 2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a semi-detached dwelling under a gable roof located on the western side of Rayleigh Road. The property has a two storey outrigger to the rear with is an original feature. The property has a single storey side infill extension to the rear.
- 2.2 The site is not located within a Conservation Area, but adjoins the Merton Hall Road Conservation Area to the rear.

## 3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal is for a new monopitch roof to an existing side infill extension replacing the existing flat roof and with a new side window, a rear extension beyond the infill/ rear outrigger measuring between 3.6m and 4.3m in depth, a rear roof extension in the form of a box dormer to the main roof slope and alterations to windows on the front elevation.
- 3.2 The ground floor rear extension has two flat roofed elements at each side with a higher curved roof element in the centre. The eaves of the flat roofed elements are 2.675m in height and the maximum height of the central curved roof section is 3.465m.
- 3.3 The roof extension comprises a full width dormer to the main rear roof ridge which would be of box design and would have a setback of 0.2m from the eaves of the property.

## 4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 There is no planning history relating to this site.

## 5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Notice displayed.  
Letters to occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 Original Consultation response  
In response to the original submission, 12 letters of objection were received from residents in Rayleigh Road and Merton Hall Road. The grounds of objection are set out in brief below:-

- Dormer over outrigger sets a poor, undesirable precedent in design terms, out of character, no other examples on this side of Rayleigh Road and would cause loss of light and outlook to adjoining properties (12)
- 'Box' design of the main roof extension would be mismatched and lack of consistency given the existing roof extension at no. 22, mansard preferred (3).
- Design of rear extension is out of character (3)
- Replacement of the first floor window with a Juliette balcony would result in a loss of privacy, more intrusive than sash window (2).
- New flank windows would cause loss of privacy (1)
- Rear extension should be limited to 3.6m in depth, 2.4m to eaves and 3.1m to ridge to match that of the neighbouring property and thus reduce the potential for adverse impact.
- Overdevelopment, out of character (1)
- Structural and drainage concerns relating to rear extension (1)

### 5.3 Amended Plans

The plans have been amended in response to the consultation. The rear outrigger roof extension, which elicited most objections, has been omitted, and the first floor Juliette balcony removed as well as one of the ground floor flank windows to the existing side infill.

- 5.4 Neighbours have been consulted on the above amendments and any additional comments will be reported to Members at Committee.

## 6. POLICY CONTEXT

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

- 6.2 Adopted Merton 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)

- 6.3 SPG: Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (2001)

## 7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The principal planning considerations are the design and its impact on the appearance of the application dwelling and surroundings as well as the impact of the proposed extensions and alterations on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

### Amendments

- 7.2 As noted earlier, the original submission has been revised in response to objections to remove the roof extension above the outrigger, the first floor Juliette balcony and one of 2 new ground floor side flank windows have been removed.

## Design & Appearance

- 7.3 The box dormer falls within the parameters of permitted development and could be built wholly independently of the ground floor extensions, therefore there are no grounds for refusal. In any event, although the Council would normally require a mansard design where planning permission IS required, with existing box dormers at both no.s 26 and 20, it would be difficult to argue that there is any demonstrable harm to the wider roofscape. There are many examples of rear roof dormers on the western side of Rayleigh Road, with some taking the form of mansards and others being of box design.
- 7.4 The replacement of the flat roof with a monopitch roof to the existing infill extension has no adverse impact.
- 7.5 The rear element would have a maximum depth of 4.3m from the rear of the 2-storey outrigger and side infill. However, this full depth would only be achieved at the centre of the extension where it has been stepped out. Towards the side, the extension would have a depth of 3.6m. The shallower sides of the extension would be under flat roofs with the central projection under a higher curved feature roof.
- 7.6 It is highlighted that many properties within Rayleigh Road have undergone rear extensions; indeed both neighbouring properties have the benefit of extensions to the rear. Whilst the majority of these extensions take on traditional designs, there are examples of unique design. One of these properties is located on a prominent plot at No. 2 Rayleigh Road and another is the neighbouring property (No. 26). Given the examples of unique design and given that views towards the single storey elements would not be readily available from the public realm, the design and appearance is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.7 It is considered the proposals to replace the existing windows within the front elevation with ones which match the original window form would improve the appearance of the building and more accurately reflect its historic character on the most publicly visible elevation..

## Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.8 The single storey rear extension is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on neighbours in terms outlook or loss of sunlight/daylight. Both neighbouring properties have single storey extensions projecting to the rear of their outriggers. The proposed extension would only project some 0.8m further than the extension to the rear of No. 22 at the boundary, and 1.5m in relation to the recessed central element. Given the modest projection beyond this property and the fact that the proposed extension sits to the north of 22, it is considered that no unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight will occur. The 3.6m deep flat roofed section matches the depth of the rear extension to no. 26 which is to the north of the application property. It is considered that the presence of the existing rear extension at this property, in addition to the separation between the properties (1.75m) ensures there would be no loss of

amenity. The rear extension would have an eaves height of 2.68m at the boundary and the higher element of the extension would be set well away from the site boundaries.

- 7.9 In order to reduce the potential for loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwelling amended plans were requested removing one of the proposed flank windows which would have afforded the applicants direct views into the kitchen of the neighbouring property (no. 26) and vice-versa. It is considered that the removal of this window furthest to the rear of the property results in a satisfactory arrangement whereby there would be no mutual overlooking or loss of privacy. In any event the remaining additional window is in the flank of the existing infill extension and could be constructed under permitted development.
- 7.9 The amended plans received also removed the proposed roof extension above the original outrigger. This should overcome the concerns of many neighbours in terms of the setting of a bad precedent and loss of outlook and light to neighbouring properties. The proposed rear roof extension would not have any impact in terms of daylight and sunlight.

## 8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The amended proposal is acceptable in terms of visual impact and neighbouring amenity and planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.

## RECOMMENDATION

### GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

subject to the following conditions:-

1. A.1 Commencement of Development
2. A.7 Approved Plans
3. B.1 External Materials to be Approved
4. D11 Construction times
4. INF1 Party Wall Act

This page is intentionally left blank