

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

11th August 2016

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
-------------	------------------------	-------------------

	16/P0328	20/01/2016
--	----------	------------

Address/Site: 40 Quicks Road, Wimbledon, SW19 1EY

(Ward) Abbey

Proposal: Retention of part ground/part first floor rear extension and rear dormer roof extension (with existing unauthorised rear first floor element reduced in depth to 2.2m)

Drawing Nos: 01(F), 02(F), 03(B), 04(F) , 05(F) & 06(F)

Contact Officer: David Gardener (0208 545 3115)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission Subject to Conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: None
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 3
- External consultations: None

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor Katy Neep.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a mid-terrace Victorian house which has been extended at ground, first and second floor levels. The extensions, which have been completed are unauthorised.
- 2.2 The application site is located on the south side of Quicks Road and is not within a conservation area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential

in character although a small parade of commercial units are located on the opposite side of Quicks Road.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 A lawful development certificate for an L shaped roof extension and planning permission for a ground floor extension have previously been approved (LBM Refs: 14/P1877 & 14/P1848). The ground floor element has not been constructed in accordance with the planning permission and an unlawful first floor extension has also been constructed. In addition, the roof extension has not been built in accordance to the plans issued a Lawful Development Certificate. All 3 elements of the current application – the ground floor and first floor extension and L-shaped roof extension all form part of a single proposal which requires planning permission.
- 3.2 The intention is to regularize the ground floor element as constructed (which has a different appearance and roof form to the single storey extension granted planning permission), retain part of the first floor extension as constructed but reduce its depth and retain the roof extension.
- 3.2 The ground floor element has a maximum depth of 4.9m, extending 3.5m along the side boundary with No. 39. This element features a flat roof with a maximum height of 3m (3.2m to top of parapet wall). The current unauthorised first floor element extends 3.35m beyond the rear wall of No.39 at first floor level. It is proposed to reduce the depth of this element by 1.15m so that it projects 2.2m beyond the rear wall of No.39.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

The following planning history is relevant:

- 4.1 14/P1877 - Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a rear roof extension with juliette balcony and installation of 2 x rooflights to front roof slope. Issued - 14/07/2014
- 4.2 14/P1848 - Erection of a single storey single storey rear and side infill extension. Granted - 15/07/2014
- 4.3 15/P3639 - Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness in respect of the retention of existing part single part two storey rear extension. Refused - 12/11/2015

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014): DM D1 (Urban design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings)
- 5.2 Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011) are:
CS.14 (Design)

5.3 The following Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is also relevant:
Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001)

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The application was publicised by means of a site notice and individual letters to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response, three letters of objection have been received. The objections are on the following grounds:

- The description of the application is misleading
- Impact of first floor element on adjoining properties
- Object to first floor even as proposed to reduce in depth, first floor extension is higher than No.39
- Restricts light to bathroom, reduces light and outlook to the side bedroom bay window
- Ground floor element does not match plans previously submitted
- Excessive scale and size of ground floor element, height on boundary excessive
- Applicant cannot be relied on to implement amendments
- Has been constructed in materials that do not match the existing stock brick
- Work has progressed since originally reported to enforcement section in June 2015

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Visual Amenity

7.1.1 Ground and First Floor Rear Extension

The current unauthorised ground and first floor rear extension has a disjointed appearance. Part of the extension is built as a party wall, straddling the boundary with No.39, but then steps in at ground and first floor level to sit wholly within the application site. This means the flank wall does not align at first floor level and gives the appearance of two separate extensions which have been shunted together to the detriment of the appearance of the house and the terrace in general. It is proposed to reduce the depth of the first floor element to remove the element that steps in so that the first floor element extends no further than the depth of the single storey rear element of no. 39. It is considered that the resulting first floor element would be acceptable in appearance. It would no longer have a staggered flank wall line and its bulk and massing would be reduced. The occupiers of No.39 have commented that the first floor extension is higher than the outrigger of their property. It should be noted that the roof itself is not any higher than the roof of No.39 and that the additional height of the flank wall when viewed from No.39 is a result of the continuation of the parapet wall, which straddles the boundary with No.39.

7.1.2 The brick currently appears much lighter than the original brickwork but will darken over time as it weathers. It is not considered to be so poor a match as to be unacceptable.

7.1.3 The wrap around ground floor extension has a flat roofed form with a parapet detail top the boundary with no.39. The flat roofed form is a common approach and is considered to be acceptable.

7.1.4 Rear Roof Extension

Officers would not normally consider a full width box dormer across the main roof and extending part way along the outrigger to be acceptable and would encourage the use of either smaller dormers or a mansard roof form. The exception is where the existing surrounding roofscape is considered to have been already compromised by neighbouring extensions. In this instance, the proposed L-shaped roof extension is not as deep as the L-shaped box dormer built under permitted development at the adjoining property, no.41 and only slightly deeper than the L-shaped roof extension at No.38 Quicks Road. Another material consideration is that at 44.8 cu m, the roof extensions are only slightly larger than could be erected under permitted development. It cannot be seen from the public realm and only extends part way down the outrigger. Taking these considerations into account, the proposed roof extensions are considered to be acceptable in this instance.

7.1.3 Overall, it is considered that the proposal complies with Policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) which requires development to respect and complement the design and detailing of the original building and complement the character and appearance of the wider setting.

7.2 Residential Amenity

7.2.1 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be required to ensure provision of appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight, quality of living conditions, amenity space and privacy, to both proposed and adjoining buildings and gardens. Development should also protect new and existing development from visual intrusion.

7.2.2 It is considered that the ground floor rear element and first floor rear element as proposed would not have an unacceptable impact on No.41 Quicks Road. The ground floor element does not project beyond the rear wall of the ground floor rear extension at No.41 whilst the first floor element is only 2.2m deep and located 1.8m from the side boundary with No.41, which means it is considered that it would not have an unacceptable impact on the bedroom window, which is splayed at this property.

7.2.3 With regards to No.39 it is considered that the ground and first floor rear extension would not be visually intrusive, overbearing or result in an unacceptable level of daylight/sunlight loss with the ground floor element projecting 3.5m from the ground floor rear wall of No.39. It should be noted that the ground floor element would be only 20cm deeper, but also 10cm lower on the side boundary with No.39 when compared to the previously approved ground floor extension (LBM Ref: 14/P1848). The first floor rear

element would be reduced in depth so that it projects only 2.2m from the first floor rear wall and not beyond the ground floor rear wall of No.39. It should also be noted that No.39 has only obscure glazed windows in the rear elevation of the outrigger at ground and first floor levels further limiting the impact of the extension.

7.2.4 It is considered that the size and position of the dormer within the roof in relation to adjoining properties and the fact that there is a minimum separation distance of 25m between the proposal and facing neighbouring windows, means the dormer would not have an unacceptable impact upon the levels of daylight/sunlight or privacy currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

8.1 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of EIA submission.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered that the ground and first floor rear extension as proposed to be amended and rear dormer roof extension is acceptable in terms of its design and appearance. It is also considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable level of daylight/sunlight loss or be visually intrusive or overbearing when viewed from Nos.39 and 41 Quicks Road. The proposal therefore accords with policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) and is acceptable in terms of its impact on visual and residential amenity.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A.7 (Approved Plans)
2. B.2 (Matching Materials)
3. C.2 (No Permitted Development (Windows and Doors))
4. C.8 (No Use of Flat Roof)
5. Informative: Unless the first floor rear element is reduced in size so that it is in accordance with the approved plans within 2 months of the date of this approval, enforcement action will be instigated by the Local Planning Authority.

To view Plans, drawings and documents relating to this application please follow:

[the link](#)

Please note that this link, and some of the related plans may be slow to load