

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
5 September 2013

Item No: 16

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	13/P0585	20/02/2013
Address/Site	1 Spencer Hill, Wimbledon SW19 4NZ	
(Ward)	Hillside	
Proposal:	Erection of two storey rear extension across lower ground floor and ground floor levels	
Drawing Nos	GAW1/1250, GAW1/9-16, GAW1/120 PA2, 109PA2, 110PA2, 111PA2, 112PA2, 113 PA2, 114 PA2, 115 PA2, 116PA2 and Design and Access Statement	
Contact Officer:	Richard Allen (8545 3621)	

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been Submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 5
- External consultations: None
- Controlled Parking Zone:

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is put before the Planning Applications Committee for decision due to the number of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is a locally listed house comprising a detached Victorian villa situated on the south side of Spencer Hill. It is a substantial four storey

building including a lower ground floor, upper ground floor with steps leading up to the entrance door and two further floors of accommodation below the eaves. The external materials are stucco with white painted window surrounds and rusticated corner quoins. It sits within a very generous plot with large gaps between the building and the side boundaries with its neighbours. There are a number of mature trees within the garden area.

To the west of the site is the Listed Grade II St John the Baptist Church with the separate church hall sitting between the church and the application site boundary. To the east of the site is 3 Spencer Hill, a detached dwelling house within a large plot situated at a lower level than the application property. To the rear of the site are detached houses in Denmark Avenue. The application site and all the neighbouring properties are within the Merton (Wimbledon West) Conservation Area.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The current proposal involves the erection of a two storey rear extension across lower ground and ground floor levels. It would extend across just over two thirds of the rear elevation and would be 8.1m in width and between 5.1 and 5.5m in height due to the sloping nature of the site.
- 3.2 At lower ground floor level the proposed rear extension would be 6m in depth closest to the boundary with no.3, extending to 8m further away. At ground floor level the extension would be 6m in depth closest to the boundary with no.3 then reducing to 4m with a 4.7m upper ground floor terrace extending beyond with a glass screen boundary and steps descending to garden level. The rear extension would be sited at least 7.5 metres from the side boundary with the rear garden of 3 Spencer Hill, the rear terrace at least 10.6m. Internally, at lower ground floor level a games room and garden store would be provided, with an enlarged kitchen and rear terrace at upper ground.
- 3.3 A simple contemporary design has been adopted for the proposed rear extension with floor to ceiling windows within the southern and western elevations which does not seek to mimic the existing building. It would replace the existing upper ground floor terrace and the unsightly rear 'tower' that currently accommodates bathrooms would be removed and the rear elevation restored with traditional windows installed at the upper levels.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 In September 1960 planning permission was refused for the conversion of the existing property into 6 x two person flats and two bedsits and erection of two storey extension (Ref.MER424/80).
- 4.2 In September 1980 planning permission and conservation area consent was refused for demolition of the existing building and erection of 3 x three storey blocks of nine flats (Refs.MER478/80 and MER5551/80).

- 4.3 In May 1981 planning permission was refused for the conversion of the existing house into five self-contained flats with rear extension and erection of two mews houses (Ref.MER441/81).
- 4.4 In January 1982 planning permission was granted for alterations to form a one bedroom self-contained flat at basement level (Ref.MER997/81).
- 4.5 In September 1993 an application was submitted for the installation of a rooflight (LBM Ref.93/P1162). However, the application was deemed to be permitted development.
- 4.6 In June 2012 planning permission was refused for the erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear and side extension and provision of enlarged basement to the rear (LBM Ref.12/P1040). Planning permission was refused on the following grounds:-

'The proposals; by reason of the sideways projection of the extension interfering with the view down the side of the existing house and the failure of the fenestration to relate well to the original; fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Merton (Wimbledon West) Conservation Area and as such are contrary to retained Policies BE.1 (Conservation areas; New Development, Change of Use, Alterations and Extensions), Be.11 (Local List; Rehabilitation and Maintenance) and BE.23 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings) within the Merton UDP (October 2003) and Policy CS14 (Design) of the Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011) and

The proposed development would, by virtue of its absolute and relative height constitute a visually intrusive form of development and create a loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the residential property at 3 Spencer Hill contrary to retained policy BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise) of the Merton UDP (October 2003) and

The proposals would involve the loss of trees and other landscape features which would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area and as such are contrary to retained Policies NE.11 (Trees-Protection) and NE.12 (Trees; Hedges and Landscape Features) within the Merton UDP'.

The current application has been submitted in order to overcome the reasons of refusal of the previous application.

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 8 letters of objection (16 signatures) has been received. The grounds of objection are set out below:-

Appearance/Impact on Conservation Area

- The existing house is very attractive and in a Conservation Area, the proposals are out of keeping and will clash with the traditional appearance of the existing property.
- the style and scale of the extension, with its preponderance of floor to ceiling glazed windows, is out of character with the existing property, neighbouring listed buildings. St. Johns Church and 3 Spencer Hill,
- would result in a very modern extension in an elevated position in a conservation area.
- will result in loss of trees and valuable green space
- extension is too deep, projects too far into the garden area
- significant number of mature trees nearby, concerned about impact, forms say no trees to be lost but no updated assessment of impact, at least one tree will be lost

Impact on Neighbours

- depth of projection into the garden and massing of extension will affect neighbours downhill and to the rear, windows and terrace will affect privacy of adjoining properties, will loom over 3 Spencer Hill
- no guarantee that existing vegetation to the boundary will not be removed
- impact exacerbated by fact that it stands on the upper slopes of a hill
- the modifications made to the scheme do not fully address the reasons for refusal of application 12/P1040. Although smaller, the extension would overwhelm nearby properties.
- large windows would 'dazzle' occupiers of properties in Denmark Hill.
- Noise from construction would affect activities at the church hall and church, used by a nursery and for noise sensitive activities such as funerals respectively. Could also impact on safety of access for children and adults
- Would affect the stability of the land and course of underground streams. Ground is potentially unstable and building down could have impact on neighbouring buildings such as listed church and church hall,
- some of those neighbours who objected on the earlier application have not been consulted on the current one

5.2 St Johns Area Residents Association

The extension would break the existing building line resulting in 'garden grabbing'. The modern extension with large plate glass windows will be out of character with the existing period house. Also any extension beyond the existing building line would destroy precious green space in the conservation area and set an undesirable precedent. The proposal will diminish the unique character of the locality and do nothing to enhance the character of the conservation area.

5.3 The Wimbledon Society

Windows are shown on plan for the upper floor in the side facing elevation but not on the side elevation. They would severely affect the privacy of the adjoining property and should be omitted. The planting zone along the side boundary is significant for the privacy of nearby properties and wildlife - a planning condition should be imposed to preclude any access to the tree and planting zone during construction with protective fencing. It would also appear

that one tree close to the southern corner of the house would be removed and a replacement tree should be provided.

5.4 Tree Officer

Tree protection and replacement tree planting condition are required.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 The relevant policies contained within the Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011) are CS13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture), CS14 (Design) and CS20 (Parking).

6.2 The retained policies within the Merton UDP (October 2003) are NE.11 (Trees-Protection), BE.1 (Conservation Areas; New Development, Change of Use, Alterations and Extensions), BE.11 (Local List-Rehabilitation and Maintenance), BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise), BE.22 (Design of New Development) and BE.23 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings).

6.2 The London Plan

The relevant policies contained within the London Plan (July 2011) are 7.6 (Architecture) and 7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology).

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning considerations concern the design and appearance of the proposed extensions and their effect upon the character and appearance of the locally listed building and Merton (Wimbledon West) Conservation Area together with neighbour amenity and tree issues.

7.2 Design/Conservation and Locally Listed Building Issues

The application property is a large detached Victorian villa and is a locally listed building. The rear facade has been altered and the unsightly three storey 'tower' extension added to the original villa to provide bathrooms. The current proposal involves the erection of a rear extension at lower ground and ground floor levels, involving removal of the existing tower addition and restoration of the original rear facade and reinstating original window proportions.

7.3 The current application has been submitted following the refusal of planning permission in June 2012 for the erection of a part single/part two storey rear and side extensions (LBM Ref. 12/P1040). The current proposal has been the subject of discussions with the Council's Conservation officer and the revised proposal has addressed concerns raised regarding the earlier scheme (see para 4.6 for grounds for refusal).

7.4 The previous submission proposed an extension that wrapped around the rear corner of the building, projecting to the side as well as to the rear and included an extension at first floor level as well as lower and upper ground floor. These elements have both been removed. The proposed rear extension

would be sited on the rear elevation of the building at lower ground and ground floor levels only. The proposed extension has been designed in a contemporary style to include large areas of glazing to the garden elevation to provide access and views across the large landscaped rear garden. It will be rendered to match the existing rear elevation. This is considered to be an acceptable approach given the more low key nature of the extension, relative to the existing building. It will in any event be scarcely visible from the public domain.

- 7.5 The scale, siting and massing of the extension is considered to be acceptable in relation to the substantial Victorian villa and its extensive grounds. The removal of the rear 'tower' addition and restoration of the rear elevation of the building will improve the appearance of the locally listed building. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of Adopted Core Strategy policy CS14 and retained UDP policies BE.1 and BE.11.

7.6 Neighbour Amenity Issues

A number of objections have been received concerning the impact of the proposal upon neighbour amenity. The proposed rear extension would be sited 7.3 metres from the boundary with 3 Spencer Hill. The only windows within the side elevation facing 3 Spencer Hill would be to the lower ground floor level and narrow 0.5m high slot windows to the kitchen. They would be screened by the boundary fencing and existing tree and shrub planting. The raised rear terrace would be sited 10.6 metres from the boundary with 3 Spencer Hill and would have a 1.2 metre high glazed balustrade and will be sited 3m away from the boundary than the existing terrace which will be removed as part of the proposals. The separation distance between the raised terrace and the boundary with 3 Spencer Hill is considered to be acceptable. The church hall to the north of the site is located at a higher level than the application site so the proposed rear extension would not affect the church hall. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of retained UDP policy BE.15.

- 7.7 Concerns have been expressed about land stability and ground/surface water drainage, however, the proposal does not involve basement excavation, the lower ground floor being set at garden level to the rear.

7.8 Trees

Although the application forms advised that no trees were to be removed, the previously submitted arboricultural report has now been revised to take account of the reduction in the width of the extension. With the refused application, it was recommended that trees T3, T5, T6, T7, T8 and T9 be removed to permit development. It is now proposed to remove only tree T6, a C category silver birch very close to the corner of the existing building. The tree officer raises no objections subject to the provision of a suitable replacement and tree protection being provided in accordance with a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement during the course of construction. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of retained policy NE.11.

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

- 8.1 The proposal involves alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling house. 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 design of the proposed extension is considered to be acceptable in planning terms and the proposal would not affect neighbour amenity. The proposal would also preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the locally listed building and Merton (Wimbledon North) Conservation Area. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. A.1 Commencement of Development
2. B.1 External Materials to be Approved
3. B.4 Details of Site/Surface Treatment
4. C.2 No Permitted Development (Windows-East Elevation)
5. C.8 No Balcony
6. D.11 Hours of Construction
7. F.5P Tree Protection
8. F.8 Site Supervision - Trees
9. F.11 Specific Tree Replacement (Silver Birch Tree)