## Agenda Item 9

| PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 7 NOVEMBER 2013 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| UPRN | APPLICATION NO. DATE VALID |
|  | 13/P2485 02/08/13 |
| Address/Site | 2A Chester Road, Wimbledon, SW19 4TW |
| (Ward) | Village |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey side and rear extension, excavation of basement level, alteration to front porch, extension to existing garage, and replacement windows to all elevations |
| Drawing Nos: | KL/WI/1250, KL/WI/200 EX, KL/WI/10 EX, KL/WI/11 EX, KL/WI/12 EX, KL/WI/15 EX, KL/WI/16 EX, KL/WI/17 EX, KL/WI/18 EX, KL/WI/20 EX, KL/WI/21 EX, KL/WI/1200 PA, KL/WI/109 PA, KL/WI/110 PA, KL/WI/111 PA, KL/WI/112 PA, KL/WI/115 PA, KL/WI/116 PA, KL/WI/117 PA, KL/WI/118 PA, Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement Report by Chalice Consulting. |

Contact Officer: Sabah Halli (0208 545 3297)

## 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 Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 9
- External consultations: None
- Controlled Parking Zone: No


## 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 application site comprises a detached property of a more traditional design, which is located along a well established residential road containing a mix of dwelling types and designs. The property has been extended single storey to the rear and was originally built with two front single garages adjacent to the entrance. The site is well vegetated along the side and rear boundaries in particular.
2.2 Site is located within the Wimbledon West Conservation Area.

## 3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

3.1 This application proposed the widening of one of the two existing front garages (indicated as garage ' $A$ ' on the proposed plans) to built up to the side/rear boundary shared with West Lodge, the installation of a small basement, installation of a single storey side extension, installation of a single storey rear extension, and replacement of the windows of the existing property.
3.2 The extended garage would remain the same in height, depth, and design aside from the increased width and the installation of a front window and door.
3.3 The proposed basement would sit under the proposed single storey rear extension and would be accessed internally through the main dwelling. Accommodation would comprise of a cinema, boiler room, shower/W.C, and gym/sauna, and would receive natural light from a small light well.
3.4 The proposed single storey side extension would be set back 1.8 m from the front building line of the property and built almost up to the side/rear boundary shared with West Lodge. It would be 3.8 m in height and finished with a flat roof. Accommodation would comprise storage/boot room, and utility room. Materials proposed are brick and painted render.
3.5 The proposed single storey rear extension would replace two existing single storey rear extensions and would have the same side building lines as the existing dwelling. It would project $4-7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ from the existing rear building line of the main dwelling and would be finished with a flat roof. Accommodation would comprise a kitchen/dining area, and extended living room. Materials proposed are brick, painted render, and powder coated aluminium windows and doors.
3.6 It is proposed to replace the existing painted timber windows of the dwelling with painted timber, sliding Sash windows.
3.7 As part of the works it is proposed to remove two category 'C' trees (Eucalyptus, and Cypress trees) and two category 'B' trees (Cypress, and Elder trees).
4. PLANNING HISTORY

92/P0312 - VARIATION OF CONDITION NO. 14 OF PLANNING
PERMISSION GRANTED ON 16TH AUGUST 1990 (90/P0406) TO ENABLE ROOF LIGHTS ON EAST AND WEST ROOF SLOPES OF NEW HOUSE TO BE CLEAR GLAZED INSTEAD OF OBSCURED GLAZED - Approved

90/P0406 - ERECTION OF A DETACHED THREE STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE WITH TWO RELATED GARAGES - Approved

## 90/P0414 - ERECTION OF A DETACHED THREE STOREY DWELLING HOUSE WITH TWO RELATED GARAGES - Approved

90/P0455 - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT TO DEMOLISH PART OF WALL FRONTING CHESTER ROAD AND WOODEN SHED ADJOINING SOUTH EASTERN REAR CORNER OF SITE IN CONNECTION WITH ERECTION OF A DETACHED THREE STOREY DWELLING HOUSE - Granted

WIM2007 - CONVERSION OF EXISTING HOUSE (4 WESTSIDE) FORMING 3 DWELLINGHOUSES \& DIVISION OF THE REMAINING LAND INTO SIX BUILDING PLOTS - Approved

WIM1975 - CONVERSION OF EXISTING HOUSE INTO 3 FLATS AND ONE MAISONETTE, THE ERECTION OF 2 GARAGES \& THE DIVISION OF THE LAND INTO SIX BUILDING PLOTS - Approved

WIM1886 - CONVERSION OF EXISTING HOUSE INTO 2 FLATS AND A COTTAGE \& DIVISION OF LAND INTO SIX BUILDING PLOTS - Refused

WIM1863 - OUTLINE - TO CONVERT EXISTING HOUSE (4 WESTSIDE) INTO THREE HOUSES AND THE DIVISION OF THE SITE INTO 17 BUILDING PLOTS - Refuse

## 5. CONSULTATION

The application has been advertised by press notice, site notice, and letters of notification to occupiers of neighbouring properties. There have been 7 representations received, on the following grounds:

- Neighbouring property should be advised on whether the works entail removal of any fencing and any fencing removed should be replaced on amenity grounds
- Trees pruned which are rooted outside of the site should also be notified to the relevant owners for amenity reasons as the trees provide screening
- Any trees removed should be replaced on privacy and amenity grounds
- The flat roofs of the extensions should not be used as terraces and should only be accessed for maintenance
- The replacement of the windows is a positive aspect
- The proposed side and rear extensions are too close to the side boundaries and do not allow any replacement of trees if needed
- The depth of the rear extension is excessive and will impact on the outlook of adjoining properties
- Materials used are important and should be in keeping with the locality
- Basement foundations will impact on nearby trees
- Trees to be removed should be replaced

Tree Officer - The arboricultural report informs us that the existing Eucalyptus tree located adjacent to garage ' $A$ ' will need to be removed to permit the construction of the development. As this is a ' $C$ ' class tree, it has a lesser importance in the landscape. But nevertheless, there will be a perceptible loss of vegetation and the applicant should consider whether there is scope to plant a replacement tree somewhere else in the frontage.

The proposed extension and basement are to be constructed outside of the root protection area (RPA) of any nearby trees.

It is noted that an Arboricultural Assessment report by Chris Mountford has been produced to assist in the consideration of tree matters. On page 3 of his report, Chris refers to T11, the RPA of which is outside of the proposed development. Chris also refers to formal planting within the grounds of 2 Chester Road, but gives no specific details, such that could be more closely compared to the detailed information provided by the applicant. The two trees shown in the photograph appear to be young specimens and it is entirely likely that their RPA is outside of the proposed development. Chris also mentions foundations affecting a tree screen at 3B Westside Common. The area adjacent to this property is already hardsurfaced, so the addition of an extension will not alter the existing ground conditions. However, to ensure that the root system is not harmed, a condition should be attached requiring details of a method of construction that will not be harmful to the neighbour's trees. Chris's comments concerning the Sycamore tree are noted and commented on above.

Conservation Officer - No comments.

## 6. POLICY CONTEXT

The relevant policies contained within the Adopted Merton Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) are BE. 1 (Conservation Areas, New Development, Change of Use, Alterations and Extensions), BE. 15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise), BE. 23 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings), and NE. 11 (TreesProtection)

Core Strategy (2011): CS 13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture), CS 14 (Design), CS 20 (Parking, Servicing, and Delivery)

Residential Extensions, Alterations, and Conversions SPG Wimbledon West Character Assessment

London Plan (2011):
7.4 (Local Character)
7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology)

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

## 7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The application has been amended since its submission to remove the proposed extension of garage ' $B$ ' and its use as a guest accommodation. This garage will be retained as existing.

### 7.2 Design

7.3 The proposed single storey side extension would not be overly visible and is not considered to be excessive in height or depth. It would also not be linked to the proposed single storey rear extension and this reduces the overall scale of extensions proposed. As such, the proposed extension is considered acceptable in design terms.
7.4 The proposed single storey rear extension would replace two existing single storey rear extensions and would have the same side building lines as the existing dwelling and therefore would be not be closer to the side boundaries than existing. It would project between $4-7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ from the back of the original dwelling however this is only 3.5 m more than the existing rear conservatory and the part of the extension with the 7.5 m projection is located more centrally within the rear elevation of the dwelling. In privacy terms, as with the single storey side extension, the flat roof can be restricted for use for maintenance purposes only.
7.5 The proposed increase in width of garage ' $A$ ' is considered acceptable in design terms. The extension is small in size and aside from the insertion of a small front windows, and door, the garage will remain the same in all respects.
7.6 The proposed basement is considered acceptable in principle. The basement would not be visible from the front or sides of the property or readily visible to from the back as the rear light well is proposed to be flush with the ground level and is small in size. The basement would also only sit below the footprint of the proposed single storey rear extension.
7.7 The proposed replacement of the existing windows within the dwelling is considered acceptable in design terms and would be to the benefit of the appearance of the property. The windows would still be of timber construction and would be of a Sash design, which is in keeping with the conservation area.
7.8 The alteration to the font porch pillars is small in scale and considered to be acceptable in design terms.
7.9 In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed works would still preserve the character and appearance of the site property and wider conservation area, inline with policies BE.1, BE.23, and CS 14.

### 7.10 Neighbour Amenity Issues

7.11 It is not considered that there would be a detrimental loss of outlook, daylight/sunlight, or privacy for the occupiers of the adjoining properties as a result of the proposed single storey side and rear extensions.
7.12 The single storey side extension would not be overly visible and is not considered to be excessive in height or depth. It would also not be linked to the proposed single storey rear extension and this reduces the overall scale of extensions proposed. It is not considered that there would result a loss of privacy because the flat roof can be restricted to use for maintenance only by a condition on any approval.
7.13 The proposed single storey rear extension would replace two existing single storey rear extensions and would have the same side building lines as the existing dwelling and so would be no close to the side boundaries. It would project between $4-7.5 \mathrm{~m}$ from the back of the original dwelling however this is only 3.5 m more than the existing rear conservatory and the part of the extension with the 7.5 m projection is located more centrally within the rear elevation of the dwelling. In privacy terms, as with the single storey side extension, the flat roof can be restricted for use for maintenance purposes only.
7.14 It is not considered that there would be any loss of outlook, daylight/sunlight, or privacy as a result of the proposed basement as the only part of it that would be visible is the flat rear light well.
7.15 The proposed extension of garage ' $A$ ' is not considered to result in a detrimental impact on the outlook or daylight/sunlight of the occupiers of the adjoining properties because the increase in width is small and the garage is staying in the same location. The new front window and door are also minor additions.
7.16 The proposed replacement windows are a positive feature and would enhance the appearance of the dwelling. The proposed alteration to the front porch is minor in scale.
7.17 In light of the above, the proposals would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenity to the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the proposal accords with policy BE. 15.
7.18 Parking
7.19 The car parking standards detailed within Schedule 6 of the UDP are maximum standards and should therefore not be exceeded unless it can demonstrated that a higher level of parking is needed.
7.20 In this instance, the parking provision at the site will remain the same (garages and parking within the front curtilage).

### 7.21 Trees/Landscaping

7.22 It is proposed to remove two category ' B ' trees and two category ' C ' trees as part of the proposed works. One of the trees to be removed (category ' C ') is within the frontage of the site and whilst noted to as being of lesser importance in the landscape, its loss would result in a perceptible loss of vegetation and so it is considered reasonable to request that this tree be replaced by condition.
7.23 The Council's Tree Officer has assessed the proposals and does not raise any objections subject to conditions being added to any approval in respect of tree protection, site supervision, and type of foundations used.

### 7.24 Local Financial Considerations

7.25 The proposed development is liable to pay the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. The CIL amount is non-negotiable and planning permission cannot be refused for failure to agree to pay CIL.

## 8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

8.2 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly there is no requirement for an EIA submission.

## 9. CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations are acceptable in terms of their scale, siting, and design, and would preserve and enhance the character of the existing property and wider conservation area, and would not result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.
9.2 Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

## RECOMMENDATION

## GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. A1 Commencement of Development (Full Application)
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B1 Approval of Facing Materials
4. C8 No Use of Flat Roofs
5. D11 Hours of Construction
6. F5P Tree Protection
7. F8 Site Supervision (Trees)
8. Non-Standard Condition: Prior to development commencing, details of a replacement tree to be located within the frontage of the site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The approved replacement tree shall be installed at the conclusion of site works, or within the first available planting season, whichever is the sooner. The identified tree shall be maintained, with replacements if necessary, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area and to comply with policy CS13 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.
9. Non - Standard Condition: The foundations to the single storey side extension shall be constructed using either a pile and non-intrusive ground beam or a pile or suspended floor slab such as the Abbey Pynford Housedeck System.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing neighbouring tree screen in accordance with policy CS 13 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.
10. Non-Standard Condition: No work shall be commenced until details of the proposed design, materials and method of construction of the foundations to be used for the Storage and Utility Room shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and the work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing neighbouring tree screen in accordance with policy CS13 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.
11. Non-Standard Condition: The approved basement and light well shall be constructed using a contiguous vertical pile foundation.

Reason to protect and safeguard the existing trees in accordance with policy CS13 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.
12. Non - Standard Condition: Structural Engineers' drawings, indicating the intended method of ensuring the stability of the fabric to be retained throughout the period of construction of the approved basement, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of the work is begun.

Reason: To safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building and to comply with policies BE. 5 and BE. 7 of the Adopted Merton Unitary Development Plan 2003.

Informative:
Note 1 to applicant
The policies listed below were relevant to the determination of this proposal.
Adopted Merton Unitary Development Plan (October 2003)
BE. 1 (Conservation Areas, New Development, Change of Use, Alterations and Extensions)
BE. 15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise)
BE. 23 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings)
NE. 11 (Trees-Protection)
Adopted Merton Core Strategy (July 2011)
CS 13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture),
CS 14 (Design),
CS 20 (Parking, Servicing, and Delivery)
Residential Extensions, Alterations, and Conversions SPG
Wimbledon West Conservation Area Character Assessment
London Plan (2011)
7.4 (Local Character)
7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology)

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
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| Klimov |
| :--- | :--- |


Klimov

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Rear Elevation } \\ \text { Existing }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1:100@A3 | 6.2013 |
| KL/WI/ 17 | EX |
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Scale: $: 50$
Scale: 1:20
Mulberry House • Chester Road • Wimbledon Common • London SW19 4TW • Ground Floor • Existing
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