

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
17 NOVEMBER 2016**

	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	16/P1418	13/04/2016
Address/Site	15 Denmark Road, Wimbledon, London, SW19 4PG	
Ward	Hillside	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing attached rear building (former school room) and two storey outrigger and the erection of new part single storey, part two storey rear extension with a basement and a lowered ground floor and 2 nd floor mansard rear roof extension.	
Drawing Nos	665/001 P2, 665/100 P2, 665/101 P5, 665/102 P6, 665/103 P3, 665/104 P4, 665/105 P3, 665/106 P4, 665/108 P5, 665/109 P2, 665/110 P3 , 665/111 P2, 665/112 P6, 665/113 P2, 665/114 P9, 665/115 P2, 665/116 P8, 665/117 P3, 665/118 P8, 665/119 P3, 665/120 P8, 665/121 P2, 665/122 P5, 665/123 P2, 665/124 P6, 665/125 P2, 665/126 P4, 665/127 P2, 665/128 P4, 665/201 P1, 665/SK010 P1, 665/SK012 P1 and 665/SK013 P3.	
Contact Officer:	Tim Lipscomb (0208 545 3496)	

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to planning conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of Agreement: No
- 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: 4
- External consultations: Yes – Historic England
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes (W1)
- Flood Zone: Flood Zone 1 (Low risk)
- Conservation Area: Yes
- Listed Building: No
- Protected trees: Protected by virtue of being in a Conservation Area (No TPOs)

- Public Transport Access Level: 2

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the number of objections received.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The site comprises a Victorian semi-detached, two-storey 2-bed single family dwelling (circa 1860's) on the north-east side of Denmark Road.

- 2.2 The existing cottage has a gabled main roof and at the rear a two-storey gabled outrigger spans the application property and the adjoining neighbour, No.15. Beyond the two-storey outrigger at the application site, a door leads directly into a 1½ storey high gable roofed building which extends all the way to the rear boundary shared with the rear gardens of houses in Murray Road. Internally, the building is open to the roof. Historically, it was briefly used as a schoolroom for less than a ten year period in the late 19th century and now forms an integral part of the cottage. The rear garden area is accessed through and sits at right angles to this building, which has led to the unusual arrangement of the back garden of No.15 being located to the rear of the garden area belonging to 16 Denmark Road, with the site having an 'L-shape' as a result.

- 2.3 There are substantial trees adjacent to the site to the rear (in the gardens of neighbouring properties). These trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order but are protected by virtue of being within a Conservation Area.

- 2.4 The site is within Sub-Area 24 of the West Wimbledon Conservation Area. The West Wimbledon Conservation Area Appraisal (2003) describes Nos.1-20 Denmark Road (which have similar features) as follows:

“Nos. 1 to 20: Ten pairs of simple semi-detached two storey cottages of about 1860 in either exposed stock brick or white paint or render, most of them having front door porches decorated with ornamented semi-circular or flat arches, white picket fencing to the front gardens, and either pairs of first floor sash windows or two storey canted bays. They exhibit many variations on this theme, including recent alterations. If these changes were not so widespread, the houses might be worthy of local listing”.

- 2.5 Neither the cottage or the integrated rear building is locally or statutorily listed. A recent request to Historic England to consider adding the former school room building to the statutory list was declined following an initial assessment in August 2016.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application proposes the demolition of the substantial existing attached rear building (one a half storey in height with a large roof space) and the outrigger to the main house. The outrigger would be rebuilt on almost the same footprint but with a single storey glazed link to the north-west and a mansard roof extension at second floor level connecting to the main roof above. The large rear building would be replaced with a new extension linked to the main house on a similar footprint but extending 0.43m to the north-west and stepping back from the rear boundary by 0.95m at ground floor.
- 3.2 The rebuilt element replacing the rear building extension would contain floorspace over 3 levels. This comprises a basement, a ground floor set just over 1m below the existing ground level and a first floor within the roofspace. The roof would be in the form of an asymmetrical gable with a dormer window in the southeast facing side elevation adjacent to the garden.
- 3.3 The proposed mansard roof element would have eaves level with those of the main dwelling. The mansard roof would be set below the main ridgeline of the property. There would be windows to the rear and side facing (northwest) elevations of the proposed roof extension. The side elevation of the mansard on the boundary with no.16 would take the form of a parapet wall, standing at the ridge height of the main dwelling.
- 3.4 The existing garden, which is located to the rear of the garden of No.16, would be retained but the ground level would be reduced to match the ground floor level of the proposed extension. Access to the rear garden would be both from the kitchen/living area and from an accessway running around the northwest side and rear of the proposed extension. To the rear of the site the first floor of the proposed extension would overhang the accessway beneath.
- 3.5 Construction materials would be brickwork, slate and zinc (roof covering to flat roof elements).
- 3.6 The originally submitted plans included solar panels to the roof of the proposed mansard extension and the rear out-shot. However, amended plans have been submitted which show the solar panels to be omitted.
- 3.7 The extensions would result in an expansion of the Gross Internal Area from 117 sqm to 215 sq m, an increase of 98 sqm, most of which is achieved by the inclusion of a basement and first floor level within the replacement rear building (88 sq m combined). The changes would result in the existing 2-bed cottage becoming a 4-bed dwelling with a small study at roof level.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 None at the application site. However, the planning history of other properties along the street is relevant:
- 4.2 No.4 Denmark Road:
09/P1415 – Erection of a roof extension. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 26-08-2009.
- 4.3 No.5 Denmark Road:
08/P0492 – Erection of rear mansard roof extension. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 16-04-2008.
- 4.4 No.6 Denmark Road:
08/P0840 – Erection of rear mansard roof extension. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 22-05-2008.
- 4.5 No.7 Denmark Road:
14/P4161 – Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of new part single part two storey rear and side infill extension and erection of rear roof extension above outrigger. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 21-01-2015.
- 4.6 No.12 Denmark Road:
14/P4506 – Retention of a rear roof extension above outrigger, with windows to rear and side of its roofslopes. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 28-01-2015.
- 4.7 No.13 Denmark Road:
11/P3137 – Erection of rear mansard roof extension above existing two storey rear addition with 2 x dormer windows, comprising 1 x dormer window to side roof slope and 1 x dormer window to rear roof slope.
- 4.8 No.14 Denmark Road:
11/P3136 – Erection of rear mansard roof extension above existing two storey rear addition with 2 x dormer windows, comprising 1 x dormer window to side roof slope and 1 x dormer window to rear roof slope. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 25-01-2012.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Standard 21-day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers. 38 letters of objection have been received from 24 addresses, including one from the St. John's Area Residents Association and one the Wimbledon Society, objecting on the following grounds:
- Demolition of former school room is loss of a heritage asset, contrary to policy.
 - No archaeological desk-based assessment has been submitted.
 - The Design Statement contains inaccuracies/omissions which might be misleading.
 - Overdevelopment/adverse impact on the character of the existing cottage, undesirable precedent
 - PV solar panels would be unsightly.

- The proposed windows, doors and glazed link are modern and are out of keeping with the existing dwelling, some of the proposed materials not in keeping.
- Proposed roof extension too large, concern that extension would be higher than the main ridgeline.
- Adverse impact and cause inconvenience in the day to day lives of those living and working nearby, works will be over an extended time period, impact of construction traffic and parking, noise, dirt, dust and mess during construction phase, work commencing at 8am and also occurring on Saturday mornings would be unreasonable, builders may not act respectfully whilst construction works are on-going. Contractor should be a member of the Considerate Constructors Scheme, noisy building works should be restricted to office hours on weekdays only.
- Loss of light, outlook and privacy to adjoining properties including overlooking to properties to the rear of the site and to the garden of 18, loss of light to rear facing first floor windows and rear garden of No.16, overbearing impact and visual intrusion to No.16.
- The rear wall of the School House marks the boundary with 21 Murray Road to the rear. This should not be replaced with a fence; a brick wall should be reinstated.
- Concerns regarding the Basement Impact Assessment, impact of a piling rig in the construction and the failure to identify known underground watercourses/no hydrology report/excavation goes below known water table.
- Concerns relating to the basement in terms of structural stability and impact on foundations of neighbouring properties.
- Query how the demolition will be undertaken, how the debris will be managed and stored, how the spoil will be excavated and removed and how will traffic disruption be managed and minimised.
- The proposed basement would contravene the Council's policy on basements.
- Concerns regarding impact on sewer system, water supply and drainage.
- Concerns that description of development does not mention the proposed basement.
- Concern that no site notice has been erected.
- Impact on third party trees.
- Parking survey submitted is not accurate and doubt is cast over the results.
- The amendments made to the application do not overcome issues previously raised.

5.2 Transport Planning:

Whilst the parking survey provided with the applications gives a useful snapshot of overnight parking demand in the neighbourhood. I am of the view it overstates the availability of spaces as in practice the proximity of crossovers, road width and to a lesser extent personal circumstance would reduce capacity/parking choice. Both Denmark Avenue and Thornton Hill would also only be available to residents outside controlled hours as they fall outside Zone VOt. Indeed the

current parking layout in nearby Denmark Avenue reflects on-street limitations to park on both sides of the street. In addition, 2 of the surveyed streets are not in the borough.

The site scores PTAL 2 this is because it falls just beyond the walk distance used for calculating PTAL (960m). In practice however, given Wimbledon's role as a regional transport hub, residents would walk the extra couple of minutes to utilise the excellent transport facilities available.

It is reasonable to assume that the increased dwelling size has the potential to add an additional demand of one-two on-street parking spaces compared to the existing situation. However, the existing property currently has unrestricted access to permits and there is currently no scope to restrict the number of permits that can be issued, although the pricing structure can have a slight deterrent effect (1st permit £65, 2nd £110 and 3rd £140). Permit free could also not be applied for an extension to an existing property. So some increase in parking stress may occur, although this is unlikely to represent grounds for refusal as spaces can be still found within the zone, albeit in neighbouring streets. The relative proximity of Wimbledon Station also reduces need.

Denmark Road is restricted in width (approximate 4 metres wide) with narrow pavements either side. Given these constraints a detailed Construction Logistics Plan would be required by condition and agreed by highways prior to the commencement of any works or site clearance. In particular, this plan will need to consider/address road safety and movement issues, removal/storage of materials, scheduling/managing deliveries and potentially the use of smaller loads and plant given the space restrictions.

5.3 Tree and Landscape Officer:

The arboricultural report provides a satisfactory assessment of the proposed development.

I would recommend attaching the following planning condition:

Tree Protection: The details and measures for the protection of the existing retained trees as contained in the approved document 'Arboricultural Report' dated 12 March 2016 and the drawing titled: 'Tree Protection Plan' numbered TPP/APA/AP/2016/065 shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing retained trees shall follow the sequence of events as detailed in the document and shall include arboricultural supervision for the duration of site works. All methods for the protection of the trees shall be retained and maintained until the completion of all site operations.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2015, Policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and Policies DM D2 and DM O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

5.4 Sustainability Officer:

Following the submission of the buildings emissions modelling data, I can confirm that the development will exceed the minimum CO2 savings required by Part L by around 25%. Whilst I have requested a slight clarification on the measures used to achieve the savings, I am satisfied that the development is now fully compliant with policy DM D2.

5.5 Conservation Officer:

The Conservation Officer objects on the basis that the demolition of the school room would be a loss to social history.

5.6 Historic England (Archaeology):

The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest.

Although the proposals are small in scale, the application does include a basement level which would completely remove any archaeological remains from within its footprint. It is acknowledged that the existing building will have had some impact on archaeological survival.

Appraisal of this application using the Greater London Historic Environment Record and information submitted with the application indicates that the development is likely to cause some harm to archaeological interest but not sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission provided that a condition is applied to require an investigation to be undertaken to advance understanding. The archaeological interest should be conserved by attaching a condition as follows:

Condition:

No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and

A. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works

B. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Informative:

The written scheme of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England's

Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

I envisage that the archaeological fieldwork would comprise the following:

Watching Brief

A watching brief involves the proactive engagement with the development groundworks to permit investigation and recording of features of archaeological interest which are revealed. A suitable working method with contingency arrangements for significant discoveries will need to be agreed. The outcome will be a report and archive.

Further information on archaeology and planning in Greater London including Archaeological Priority Areas is available on the Historic England website.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require further information or assistance. I would be grateful to be kept informed of the progress of this application.

Please note that this response relates solely to archaeological considerations. If necessary, Historic England's Development Management or Historic Places teams should be consulted separately regarding statutory matters.

5.7 Historic England (in response to request for the building to be statutorily listed):

Historic England has received an application to assess a former school to the rear of 15 Denmark Road, Wimbledon for listing. This is a plain single-storey school room, of c1873, built in stock brick and attached to the rear of an 1860 cottage, part of which was already used as a school. The school closed as early as 1883, presumably reflecting improvements in educational provision and the construction of a purpose-built board school. The building now forms an integral extension to the cottage and is threatened with demolition.

Based on the information provided and with reference to the Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings (DCMS, 2010), and the Historic England Listing Selection Guide: Education Buildings (April 2011), the former school to the rear of 15 Denmark Road is not recommended for listing for the following principal reasons:

- Lack of architectural interest: the Victorian building is plain, functional and typical of its date, demonstrating little further architectural interest or innovation;

- Lack of historical interest: its use as a schoolroom was short-lived, it is not associated with any nationally important individual, and does not further our understanding of Victorian schools;
- Rarity: better examples of purpose built Victorian schoolrooms of this date survive elsewhere in Greater London;
- Date: the building was constructed after 1840, when progressively greater selection is required.

Recommendation: Reject

5.8

Flood Risk Engineer:

The Structa FRA addendum has provided additional information and a rebuttal to the comment made regarding the use of passive drainage measures around the basement, such as a gravel blanket (which are not proposed). Detail has also been provided regarding the proposed pumps and non return valves are now incorporated.

If you are minded to grant approval, please include the following conditions:

Condition:

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy 5.13, Merton's Policy DM F2 and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to no more than 5l/sec for the 1 in 100 year storm plus climate change and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; ii. include a timetable for its implementation; iii. include a CCTV survey of the existing surface water connection to the main sewer and site wide drainage network to establish its condition is appropriate.

and

iii. provide a drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason:

To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage, to reduce the risk of flooding and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

Condition:

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme to reduce the potential impact of groundwater ingress both to and from the proposed development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall address the risks both during and post construction as highlighted in the submitted CMS.

Reason:

To ensure the risk of groundwater ingress to and from the development is managed appropriately and to reduce the risk of flooding in compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies, DM D2 and DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

INFORMATIVES:

It is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off-site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of ground water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

5.9 Structural Engineer:

I am happy with the outline CMS submitted by Structa. The following documents must be submitted before any works commence on site.

- A) Detailed Construction Method Statement supplied by the Contractor undertaking the respective works such as a) Piling b) Excavation c) Construction of reinforced concrete slab and walls.
- B) Engineering drawings of the temporary works (Piles, props etc).
- C) Construction Management Plan - How the Contractor plans to access site with the piling rig and how he plans to transport the muck. Looking at the site plan, there is very limited space to access from the front and not sure if there is access through the rear of the property.

6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014):

DM O2	Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features
DM D1	Urban design and the public realm
DM D2	Design considerations in all developments
DM D3	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
DM D4	Managing heritage assets
DM F1	Support for flood risk management

- DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
- DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards

6.2 LDF Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

- CS6 Wimbledon Sub-Area
- CS13 Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
- CS14 Design
- CS15 Climate Change
- CS16 Flood Risk Management
- CS17 Waste Management
- CS20 Parking, Servicing and Delivery

6.3 London Plan (2015) policies (as amended by Minor Alterations to the London Plan March 2016):

- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- 7.21 Trees and woodlands

The site is within the West Wimbledon Conservation Area (Sub-Area 24) and an Archaeological Priority Zone. The site is not in a flood risk area. The existing building is not statutorily or locally listed.

6.4 Other guidance:

- Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions SPG 2001
- The West Wimbledon Conservation Area 2003
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The key planning issues in this assessment are the loss of the existing former school room building, the design quality of the proposed extensions, including the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the impact on neighbouring amenity including the basement, the impact on trees and the impact on parking/highway considerations including construction period.

7.2 Character of the Area and Heritage considerations

7.2.1 Policies DMD2 and DMD3 seek to ensure a high quality of design in all development, which relates positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context,

urban layout and landscape features of the surrounding area. Policy DMD2 also seeks to ensure that trees are protected from adverse impacts from development. Policy DM D4 seeks to ensure that development in Conservation Areas either preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, the policy seeks to ensure that harm is not caused to heritage assets. Core Planning Policy CS14 supports these SPP Policies.

7.2.2 The West Wimbledon Conservation Area Appraisal (2003) describes Nos.1-20 (which have similar features) as follows:

“Nos. 1 to 20: Ten pairs of simple semi-detached two storey cottages of about 1860 in either exposed stock brick or white paint or render, most of them having front door porches decorated with ornamented semi-circular or flat arches, white picket fencing to the front gardens, and either pairs of first floor sash windows or two storey canted bays. They exhibit many variations on this theme, including recent alterations. If these changes were not so widespread, the houses might be worthy of local listing”.

7.2.3 The existing dwelling is not statutorily or locally listed. However, it is within a Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset. The dwelling and attached rear one and a half storey building can be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The Conservation Area Appraisal makes it clear that the key feature of this part of the Conservation Area is the frontage of the dwellings. Whilst the rear building would be demolished, the proposal does not involve the loss of an undesignated heritage asset, as the dwelling and the frontage of the dwelling would be retained.

7.2.4 Loss of school room extension:

7.2.5 The proposed development would result in the loss of the former rear school room structure. This element is to the rear of the site and the historic and architectural value of the building is not considered to be so significant as to mean that its demolition and suitable replacement would be unacceptable. It was only used as a school room for a period of ten years, following that it was used as a builder's workshop and more recently as a studio. It now forms an integrated part of the house and curtilage. The extension is not remarkable in appearance, externally or internally and is not visible from the public realm. Its loss is not considered sufficient grounds for refusal in terms of contribution to the Conservation Area. Historic England's report advises that the building is typical of its date and *'demonstrates little further architectural interest or innovation'*, exhibits a lack of historical interest, *'its use as a schoolroom was shortlived, it is not associated with any nationally important individual, and does not further our understanding of Victorian schools'* and is not rare. Better examples of purpose built Victorian schoolrooms of this date elsewhere in London and the building was constructed after 1840, when progressively greater selection is required. Therefore, it is considered that there are insufficient grounds to resist the principle of the demolition and

replacement of the existing rear structure, subject to the acceptability of the replacement.

7.2.6 Proposed Replacement Two Storey/Single Storey Extension:

7.2.7 The proposed development would be entirely to the rear of the dwelling and therefore there would be little if any discernible impact on the streetscene.

7.2.8 The proposed new extension would involve the demolition of the existing rear two storey outrigger as well as the one and a half storey rear building. The proposed two-storey extensions largely replace the existing built form. The mansard roof extension does not replace an existing roof extension and this element of the proposal would add significantly to the bulk and massing of the existing building.

7.2.9 The school room out-shot, to be demolished, would be replaced with a two-storey outshot, with the same eaves height 3.2m (when viewed from the garden of No.16) but a different roof form. The ridge of the proposed out-shot would be 4.7m in height, whereas the existing out-shot has a ridge height of 4.4m. The proposed out-shot would have a pitched, ridged roof but the ridge would be non-central, with a roof pitch of 48 degrees to the side with No.16 (southeast) and a roof pitch of 26 degrees to the side with No.14 (northwest). This asymmetrical roof form is not particularly characteristic of the area but it is considered that it would not adversely impact on the character of the area. This element of the proposed extensions replaces an existing rear building of a similar massing and siting and it is considered that there would be no harm caused to the character of the area as a result of this rear extension.

7.2.10 The proposed dormer window to the side of this out-shot is fairly lightweight in appearance and is not considered to visually dominate the out-shot. The dormer would have minimal external cladding and would appear as a high quality addition.

7.2.11 The scheme proposes that the rear extension be constructed from London stock brick, lead cladding and a natural slate roof covering. This palette of materials is considered to be appropriate to the context of the site and would respect the historic character of the Conservation Area.

7.2.12 Rear Mansard Roof Extension:

7.2.13 Of the group of 20 cottages (1-20 Denmark Road) sharing a similar architectural form, 7 have been granted planning permission for mansard roof extensions over the rear outrigger to a depth of 3.4m from the rear main wall. It is considered that a specific design and scale of roof extension has been established within the group, adherence to which ensures some ongoing consistency of appearance. The proposed roof extension generally mirrors the one already constructed next door at No.14, as well as echoing the other six at no's 4, 5, 6, 7, 12 and 13. The mansard roof extension would have a roof

pitch of 70 degrees, which is a suitable pitch for a mansard roof extension and consistent with other roof extensions granted in the locality. The use of a natural slate roof covering is also considered to be suitable to the character of the area.

7.2.14 The original submission has been amended to reduce the parapet height to ensure that the second floor roof extension is not visible from the street, to minimise the visual impact of the proposed development, and to be commensurate with existing roof extensions within the group of cottages.

7.2.15 The proposed development is considered to acceptable in principle. Whilst the extensions are substantial, the extension to the rear largely replaces existing built form with only marginal changes in massing and the proposed roof extension is consistent with other roof extensions in the street which have been found to be acceptable. It is therefore, considered that the proposal would be acceptable in visual terms and would satisfactorily preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to comply with Policies DM D2, DM D3 and DM D4 in relation to visual amenity.

7.3 Basement accommodation

7.3.1 The proposal would introduce a basement under the footprint of the replacement rear building. Therefore the proposal must comply with the specific requirements of Policy DM D2. The basement would be wholly contained within the curtilage of the application property and a Basement Construction Methodology Statement has been submitted which the Council's Structural Engineer considers to be acceptable subject to suitable conditions being imposed.

7.3.2 The basement generally sits under the footprint of the existing building and does not encroach upon the rear amenity space. It has been pulled away from the boundary at the rear by 0.95m to take account of adjoining trees and an arboricultural impact assessment has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer is happy with the conclusions reached raises no objection to the proposal subject to suitable conditions.

7.3.3 The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk and SUDS Assessment along with a Technical Addendum (submitted to address the comments of the Council's Flood Risk Officer), which concludes that potential sewer flooding would be mitigated with the use of non-return valves at outgoing manholes, thereby increasing the development resilience to flooding from sewers. The report concludes that there is no requirement to install gravel blankets or other mitigation around the basement to militate against groundwater flood risk. In terms of drainage implications, the Council's Flood Risk Management Engineer has considered the details and raises no objection.

7.3.4 The submitted plans do not show the specific use of the proposed basement. However, there are no light wells serving the basement and

the agent has confirmed, in email dated 01/06/2016 that the basement would be used for storage and would be non-habitable.

7.3.5 The Council's Sustainability Officer is happy with the information provided in the submitted Energy Strategy Statement in terms of contribution to mitigating the impact of climate change.

7.3.6 The proposal is, therefore, considered to comply with Policy DM D2 in relation to the provision of a basement.

7.4 Impact on trees

7.4.1 There are trees located adjacent to the rear boundary. Whilst not protected by way of a Tree Preservation Order, these trees are protected by virtue of being within a Conservation Area. The trees currently make a significant contribution to public amenity.

7.4.2 The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Report which states that no trees would need to be removed and no trees would require pruning as a result of the proposed development. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has considered the proposals and concludes that the Arboricultural Report provided is a fair assessment of the impact on trees and raises no objection. The impact on trees is considered to be acceptable.

7.5 Neighbouring Amenity

7.5.1 Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties.

7.5.2 Impact on No.14 (to the northwest):

7.5.3 The neighbouring property to the north-west is part of a similar pair of semi-detached cottages. There is a gap between the flank walls of the main house and existing rear building on the application site and the side boundary with No.14. The small single storey element of the proposed extension would have a mono-pitch roof form, with an eaves height of approximately 3m to the northwest side, along with a separation to the boundary of approximately 1m. Given its limited height, combined with the separation from the boundary, the new single storey element is not considered to impact on the amenities of the occupiers at No.14 Denmark Road.

7.5.4 The bulk and mass of the proposed rear extension would largely replace the existing and the eaves height would not be higher than existing. The proposed extension would have the same depth as the existing out-shot. The proposed out-shot would have a ridge height of 4.7m, whereas the existing has a ridge height of 4.4m. The ridge of the proposed extension would be further from the shared boundary with No.14 than the existing ridge. The existing ridge is separated from the boundary by 3.7m and the proposed ridge would be separated from the boundary by some 4.6m. Whilst the ridge would be marginally higher, it is considered that the proposed extension would have a similar impact

on the amenities of No.14 as the roof would slope away at a similar edge from eaves of the same height. Therefore, it is considered that the impact on No.14 would be acceptable.

7.5.6 Two rooflights are proposed within the roofplane facing towards No.14 serving the first floor bathroom window and second floor bedroom/study. They would be set at high level with an internal sill height of over 1.7m and would not therefore overlook.

7.5.7 Impact on No.16 (to the southeast):

7.5.8 The proposed roof extension would result in a parapet wall projecting from the ridge and extending out over the existing two-storey, pitched roof outrigger. This parapet wall would be visible from the rear facing first floor window of No.16. However, due to the separation distance from this window (3.5m from the centre of this window) and the fact that the existing two-storey outrigger currently restricts much of the light entering this window, it is considered that the loss of outlook and ambient daylight would be very slight and would not result in material harm to residential amenity.

7.5.9 The ridge of the proposed extension would be closer to the shared boundary with No.16 than the existing ridge (the existing ridge is separated from the boundary by 2.2m and the proposed ridge would be separated from the boundary by some 1.4m and the angle of the roofslope would be slightly greater. However, the roof would continue to slope away from the boundary with No.16 and as the eaves height would be no greater, it is considered that there would only be a marginal increased impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No.16. Therefore, it is considered that the impact on No.16 would be acceptable.

7.5.10 The existing rear building has no openings above eaves level in the southeast elevation. It has a large window and door facing towards its own garden area. The proposed extension would include a high level rooflight to a corridor on the roof plane directly adjacent to the garden of No.16. A proposed dormer window would be positioned 3m from the boundary with No.16 and would be fitted with fixed louvres restricting views below 1.7m from floor level and it is considered that the siting and louvre feature would mitigate against sideways overlooking to the rear garden of No.16. Subject to suitable conditions, there is not considered to be a material loss of privacy to no.16.

7.5.11 Impact on No 17 Denmark Road

Within the reconstructed rear building, there would be a side facing first floor window set partly above and partly below eaves height facing towards the garden into the courtyard of No.15 with the garden of No.17 beyond at a distance of 5.4m to the boundary. The dormer window has been designed with fixed external louvres to restrict views of the neighbouring garden. The applicant has provided a section drawing which shows that views to the immediate garden space of the application site would be available below the louvres but higher views

out would only be possible at a height of over 1.7m. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in material overlooking.

7.5.12 Impact on properties to the rear in Murray Road

7.5.13 The proposal would largely replace the existing built form on site and it is considered that there would be no materially harmful impact on the residential amenities of occupiers to the rear of the site. The proposal would introduce a rear facing mansard roof extension, at a distance of 10.3m from the rear boundary. However, this form of extension is common in the area and the intervisibility created is considered to not result in a material loss of privacy to occupiers to the rear. It is noted that the rear gardens of properties to the rear, along Murray Road, are much longer than the gardens along Denmark Road. There would be a window to window separation from the proposed mansard to the rear of properties along Murray Road in excess of 40m, which greatly exceeds the Council's standards.

7.5.14 In response to the adjoining neighbour's concerns about replacement of the existing brick wall on the boundary forming part of the existing building with a fence, the application has been amended to show that a brick wall would be retained on the rear boundary, to form the boundary treatment. The retention of this wall to form the rear boundary would also minimise any ground works in close proximity to important off-site trees. This arrangement would be suitable and would be an improvement over the timber fencing originally proposed.

7.5.15 It is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of residential amenity, subject to conditions.

7.6 Highway, traffic and parking considerations

7.6.1 Core Strategy Policy CS 20 considers matters of pedestrian movement, safety, servicing and loading facilities for local businesses and manoeuvring for emergency vehicles as well as refuse storage and collection.

7.6.2 The site has a PTAL rating of 2 (poor). The proposed development would enlarge the dwelling but would not result in an additional residential unit. There is currently no on-site parking. There is external access to and space within the garden for bike storage.

7.6.3 Although the Council's Transport Planner has some criticisms of the assumptions made with the parking stress survey, he nonetheless concludes that the proposal would only marginally increase the demand for parking in the area, as the proposal is for an extension to the existing house from 2 bedrooms to 4 bedrooms, rather than an additional dwelling house.

7.6.4 The parking of contractors' vehicles has the potential to adversely impact on the local highway network throughout the course of the works. This disturbance would be transient and it would not be reasonable to refuse the application on this basis. However, if

permission is granted a condition for a Construction Logistics Plan is recommended to ensure that the impacts throughout the construction phase are minimised as far as possible.

- 7.6.5 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in highway terms. The submitted parking stress survey was intended to clearly demonstrate the level of parking capacity in the locality. However, following several versions of this report, some of which included serious flaws in the methodology, it is clear that local residents do not accept the argument that there is sufficient parking capacity in the area. However, notwithstanding the results of this survey, the increase in parking demand from these extensions would not be so great as to warrant a refusal. Whilst vehicles would need to access the site throughout the construction phase it would not be reasonable to refuse on this basis if the impact can be minimised throughout what would be a transitional, temporary period of time.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 There is no objection in principle to the proposed development.
- 8.2 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the impact on neighbouring amenity, provision of basement accommodation, impact on trees and parking.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Permission subject to Conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of development
2. A7 Approved Plans. 665/001 P2, 665/100 P2, 665/101 P5, 665/102 P6, 665/103 P3, 665/104 P4, 665/105 P3, 665/106 P4, 665/108 P5, 665/109 P2, 665/110 P3 , 665/111 P2, 665/112 P6, 665/113 P2, 665/114 P9, 665/115 P2, 665/116 P8, 665/117 P3, 665/118 P8, 665/119 P3, 665/120 P8, 665/121 P2, 665/122 P5, 665/123 P2, 665/124 P6, 665/125 P2, 665/126 P4, 665/127 P2, 665/128 P4, 665/201 P1, 665/SK010 P1, 665/SK012 P1 and 665/SK013 P3.
3. B3 External Materials as Specified.
4. F05 Tree Protection. The details and measures for the protection of the existing retained trees as contained in the approved document 'Arboricultural Report' dated 12 March 2016 and the drawing titled: 'Tree Protection Plan' numbered TPP/APA/AP/2016/065 shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing retained trees shall follow the sequence of events as detailed in the document and shall include arboricultural supervision for the duration of site works. All methods for the protection of the trees shall be retained and maintained until the completion of all site operations.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.21 of the

London Plan 2015, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

5. D11 Construction Times
6. H10 Construction Vehicles, Washdown Facilities etc (major sites). Development shall not commence (including demolition) until a Construction Logistics Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to accommodate:
 - (i) Parking of vehicles of site workers and visitors;
 - (ii) Loading, unloading and removal of plant and materials;
 - (iii) Storage of construction plant and materials;
 - (iv) Control of dust, smell and other effluvia;
 - (v) Control of surface water run-off.
 - (vi) Scheduling/managing deliveries.
 - (vii) Measures to address road safety/movement issues.No development shall be carried out except in full accordance with the approved Construction Logistics Plan.

Reason: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies 6.3 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

7. D10 External Lighting
8. K2 Archaeology. Condition:

No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and

 - A. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
 - B. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: In order to provide the opportunity to record the history of the site and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. Condition:

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water

by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy 5.13, Merton's Policy DM F2 and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

- i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site to no more than 5l/sec for the 1 in 100 year storm plus climate change and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - ii. include a timetable for its implementation; iii. include a CCTV survey of the existing surface water connection to the main sewer and site wide drainage network to establish its condition is appropriate.
- and
- iii. provide a drainage management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

Reason:

To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage, to reduce the risk of flooding and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

10. Condition:

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme to reduce the potential impact of groundwater ingress both to and from the proposed development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall address the risks both during and post construction as highlighted in the submitted CMS.

Reason:

To ensure the risk of groundwater ingress to and from the development is managed appropriately and to reduce the risk of flooding in compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2011, policy CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies, DM D2 and DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Polices Plan 2014.

11. Condition. No development shall commence until the following documents have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- A) Detailed Construction Method Statement supplied by the Contractor undertaking the respective works such as a) Piling b) Excavation c) Construction of reinforced concrete slab and walls.
- B) Engineering drawings of the temporary works (Piles, props etc).
- C) Construction Management Plan - How the Contractor plans to access site with the piling rig and how he plans to transport the muck. Looking at the site plan, there is very limited space to access from the front and not sure if there is access through the rear of the property.

The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved documents.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

12. Condition. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the fixed position louvres to the proposed dormer window, shown on drawing 665/201 P1, shall be installed and retained thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

13. Condition – rooflights in the southeast and northwest facing roofslopes to have minimum cill height of 1.7m above FFL and first and second floor bathroom and study window to the northwest facing elevation shall be fixed and glazed with obscured glass up to an internal sill height of a minimum of 1.7m and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

INFORMATIVES

1. INF 15 Discharge conditions prior to commencement of work
2. INF 01 Party Walls Act
3. INFORMATIVE:
It is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off-site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of ground water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).
4. INFORMATIVE
Advice regarding permeable and porous hardstandings can be found in the document 'Guidance on the Permeable Surfacing of Front Gardens' available at
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pavingfrontgardens>
5. INFORMATIVE
The written scheme of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological practice in

accordance with Historic England's Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load