

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE  
19 OCTOBER 2017**

**APPLICATION NO.**

**DATE VALID**

17/P3360

04/09/2017

**Address/Site** 21 Goodenough Road, Wimbledon, SW19 3QW

**Ward** Dundonald

**Proposal:** Retention of a part single/part two storey rear extension and an L-shaped rear roof extension.

**Drawing Nos** Site Location Plan, Block Plan, Volume calculations plan, and 1724/202 (Plans and Elevations).

**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: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 7
- External consultations: No
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes (W5)
- Flood Zone: Flood Zone 1 (Low risk)
- Conservation Area: No
- Listed Building: No
- Protected trees: No

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Grocott.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling to the western side of Goodenough Road.
- 2.2 Building works to construct a part two-storey, part first floor extension with a roof extension above are currently at the latter stages of construction. The current application seeks to retain these works.
- 2.3 The surrounding area is suburban in character.
- 2.4 The site is not in a Conservation Area.
- 2.5 The dwelling is not statutorily or locally listed.

### **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The application seeks planning permission for the retention of the existing part single, part first floor extension and an L-shaped roof extension above.
- 3.2 The part single storey, part first floor extension has been previously granted permission under application ref. 17/P1446 and comprises the following:
- The erection of an L-shaped single storey rear extension which spans the width of the site with an eaves height of 2.7m.
  - The erection of a rear first floor extension, above the previously existing single storey outrigger. This extension has a mono-pitch roof with an eaves height of 5.1m.
- 3.3 In addition, the current application seeks retention of the L-shaped dormer window which has been constructed above the first floor extension and to the roof of the main dwelling and for the insertion of two rooflights to the front elevation.
- 3.4 The dormer window covers the majority of the two-storey outrigger below. The parapet walls to either side of the roof extension have been raised. The chimney has also been removed as part of the proposals. The dormer includes two rear facing windows (one of which is a Juliet balcony).
- 3.5 The dormer window would be a flat roof, L-shaped dormer with a total volume of 39.86 cubic metres.
- 3.6 Construction materials for the parapet walls are brickwork, the roof extension is slate-hung.
- 3.7 The proposed roof extension is not higher than the ridgeline of the property and the proposal does not involve raising the height of the main ridgeline.

#### **4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

##### **Application site:**

- 4.1 17/P1446 - PART DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE/PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION. Grant Permission subject to Conditions 11-07-2017.
- 4.2 17/P2569 - APPLICATION FOR A LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE FOR THE ERECTION OF AN L-SHAPED REAR ROOF EXTENSION WITH JULIETTE BALCONY AND THE INSTALLATION OF 2 X ROOF LIGHTS TO THE FRONT ROOF SLOPE. Refuse Certificate of Lawfulness 25-08-2017 for the following reason:
1. The proposed roof extension, by reason of being part of a single building operation with the construction of a part single/part two-storey extension , would exceed the permitted development tolerances set out in Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Planning permission would therefore be required.

#### **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Standard 21-day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers. 7 letters of representation have been received objecting on the following grounds:
- Property has been over-extended.
  - Unacceptable reduction in garden space.
  - The roof is overly dominant.
  - Overlooking.
  - Previous application should never have been permitted.
  - Undesirable precedent
  - Out of character with the area
- 5.2 One letter received from the office of Stephen Hammond MP making the following comments:
- The scale of the development has a considerable impact on the gardens behind in Cochrane Road.
  - The size of the development is significant in relation to the size of the original dwelling and leaves very little garden.
  - The rear facing windows are large, meaning that it gives little privacy to neighbours.
  - Consequent loss of light.
  - Increase in noise as useable part of the retained garden is now adjacent to the rear boundary.

- If large developments such as this go ahead there will be a change to the nature of the roads and a consequent pressure on schools and other infrastructure.
- I believe much of this is permitted development but perhaps it would be worth seeking amendments to reduce the size of the windows.

## **6. POLICY CONTEXT**

### 6.1 Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014):

DM O2	Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features
DM D2	Design considerations in all developments
DM D3	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

### 6.2 LDF Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS6	Wimbledon Sub-Area
CS13	Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
CS14	Design

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

7.4	Local character
7.6	Architecture
7.19	Biodiversity and access to nature

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The key planning issues in this assessment are the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the reduction in garden space.

### 7.2 **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**

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. Core Planning Policy CS14 supports these SPP Policies.

7.2.2 The part single storey, part first floor extension has been previously assessed and permitted under application ref. 17/P1446. Therefore, this element of the proposals has been previously established as being acceptable in planning terms. Consequently, the key consideration will be the impact of the roof extension above.

- 7.2.3 It is of note that if the dormer window extension had been carried out after the substantial completion of the part single storey, part first floor extension, then the proposed extensions would not have required further planning permission. However, the roof extension was carried out in conjunction with the part single storey, part first floor extension and as such represented one single building operation, which, in its entirety, would not have fallen within the tolerances of Permitted Development. Notwithstanding, it should be noted that the proposed extensions could have been carried out lawfully if they had been carried out as separate building operations. Equally, if the roof extension were removed, it could be reinstated as a single building operation, which would not require planning permission. Officers consider this to be a material consideration of significant weight in the assessment.
- 7.2.4 There are a number of roof extensions in the locality, including L-shaped roof extensions. It is of note that an L-shaped roof extension was permitted at 11a Goodenough Road under application ref.15/P2376. This roof extension projects 3.5m beyond the rear wall of the two-storey dwelling (the same depth as that currently proposed at the application site).
- 7.2.5 An L-shaped roof extension has also been granted permission at 13 Goodenough Road, under application ref. 15/P2126. This roof extension projects 3m beyond the rear wall of the two-storey dwelling.
- 7.2.6 The applicant has also referenced a number of other proposals:
- 15 William Road (16/P4624)
  - 21 William Road (15/P0976)
  - 14 Newton Road (15/P0609)
  - 25 Caroline Road (15/P0511)
- 7.2.7 The proposal at 15 William Road was for an L-shaped roof extension which projected beyond the main rear wall of the dwellinghouse by 3.5m
- 7.2.8 The proposal at 21 William Road was for an L-shaped roof extension, involving raising the ridge level, which projected beyond the rear wall of the main dwelling by 3.3m.
- 7.2.9 The application at 14 Newton Road was for a Lawful Development Certificate and as such is not directly comparable. An L-shaped roof extension which projected beyond the main rear wall of the dwellinghouse by 5.6m was concluded to not require planning permission.
- 7.2.10 The proposal at 25 Caroline Road was for an L-shaped roof extension which projected beyond the main rear wall of the dwellinghouse by 4.3m.

- 7.2.11 Whilst the examples cited above are in fairly close proximity to the site, on streets with similar characteristics to Goodenough Road and made under the same policy background (same Development Plan policies), each application must be assessed on its own merits. However, the examples cited do make it clear that there are a number of L-shaped roof extensions in the locality and that the proposed development is not an alien form of development but one that would be fairly commonplace in the area.
- 7.2.12 The key consideration in this case is that the resultant extensions (part single storey, part first floor extension and roof extension) could have been constructed lawfully, if they had been separate operations. This is a fall-back position which must be recognised in the assessment.
- 7.2.13 The fact that the works could have been completed lawfully, if carried out separately and the fact that this type of roof extension is not uncommon in the area, is such that it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area.

## **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 The part single storey, part first floor extension has been granted under application ref. 17/P1446 and therefore it would not be reasonable to revisit this conclusion as part of the current application.
- 7.5.3 The addition of a roof extension above significantly increases the bulk and massing of the extensions permitted under 17/P1446, particularly by virtue of the parapet walls to either side.
- 7.5.4 The addition of the roof extension does result in some marginal reduction in light to the neighbouring properties, 17 and 21 Goodenough Road. It is noted that there is a two-storey outrigger at No.21, which adequately mitigates against the impact of the roof extension. The proposed roof extension would project 1.7m beyond the existing two-storey outrigger and this relationship is not considered to be materially more harmful than the relationship permitted under application ref.17/P1446.
- 7.5.5 The roof extension is separated from the boundary with No.17 by 1.5m and this is considered sufficient to avoid an adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No.17.
- 7.5.6 In terms of overlooking to the rear, the extensions approved under application ref. 17/P1446 included a rear facing first floor window at a distance of 7.8m from the rear boundary of the site. The proposed roof

extension includes a second floor bedroom window at a distance of 8.8m from the rear boundary of the site. Therefore, whilst there would be additional windows to the rear, these windows would be at a further distance from the neighbouring properties to the rear than the approved first floor windows.

- 7.5.7 In terms of a perception of overlooking, there are now more rear facing windows at a high level than previously, which would result in a perception of overlooking to some degree. Whilst the concerns of neighbouring residents are noted, it is considered that it would not be reasonable to refuse permission on this basis, given that the windows are further from the boundary than previously permitted and overlooking is possible in any event from existing windows at the application site and neighbouring properties.
- 7.5.8 The separation distance to properties to the rear is such that it is considered that there would be no material harm caused by way of loss of light to the properties to the rear.
- 7.5.9 As set out above, if the roof extension had been carried out as a single building operation, following the construction of the part single storey, part first floor extension, it would have been lawful under Permitted Development rights rules. This represents a material consideration of significant weight.
- 7.5.10 Officers conclude that the proposed roof extension would not result in additional overlooking over and above that approved under application ref. 17/P1446. It is noted that the rear of houses along Goodenough Road and Cochrane Road are in fairly close proximity (as are a number of roads in the vicinity), however, the current proposal would not result in significant additional overlooking.
- 7.5.11 It is considered that the proposed extension would not result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity and the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DM D2 in this regard.

## **7.6 Garden space**

- 7.6.1 Policy DM D2 seeks to retain an appropriate amount of garden space for dwellings. The policy states that “For all new houses, the council will seek a minimum garden area of 50sqm as a single useable regular shaped amenity space”. The garden space retained would be approximately 21sqm. However, this policy relates to the provision of new houses and is not directly applicable in relation to extensions to existing houses.
- 7.6.2 Notwithstanding the above, under application ref. 17/P1446, the retained garden space was not objectionable and as such this matter has been established and the current application would not result in any further loss of garden space.

## **7.7 Highway, traffic and parking considerations**

7.7.1 The proposal is for extensions to an existing dwelling and there is unlikely to be a significant increase in traffic movements associated with the development.

## **7.8 Other matters**

7.8.1 The points raised by the neighbouring property have been carefully considered, however, the following response is also offered:

- In terms of noise, under application ref. 17/P1446, the useable garden space was located at the rear of the site. There is no change of use and whilst the useable garden area is condensed towards the rear of the site, this arrangement has already been granted permission and as such it would not be reasonable to revisit this aspect of the proposal. Any unreasonable noise levels would be a matter for Environmental Health legislation.
- Whilst the dwelling is now significantly larger than when first constructed, this is not a planning consideration. The impact on the character of the area and the impact on neighbours are the key considerations.
- In terms of setting a precedent, each application is assessed on its own individual merits and it is very unlikely that two sites will be identical. However, in this case the principle of development is acceptable. There is no concern regarding the setting of a precedent, as substantial two-storey extensions and L-shaped roof extensions have been permitted in the immediate locality already.
- There is no increase in the number of dwellings and it would not be consistent with other planning decision to refuse this application for residential extensions on the basis of increased pressure on school places and other infrastructure.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

8.1 There is no objection in principle to the proposed development.

8.2 The part single storey, part first floor extension has previously been assessed as being acceptable and subsequently granted planning permission. The proposed roof extension above would have been permitted development if it had been carried out as a separate operation, which is a material consideration of significant weight.

8.3 The proposed development is not considered to result in material harm to the character of the area and having regard to the impact on neighbours as a result of 17/P1446 and the fact that the end result could have been achieved lawfully if constructed separately, it is



considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant Permission subject to Conditions.

1. A1 Commencement of development
2. A7 Approved Plans. Site Location Plan, Block Plan, Volume calculations plan, and 1724/202 (Plans and Elevations).
3. B3 External Materials as Specified.
4. C02 No Permitted Development (Windows and Doors). Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window or door other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the northwest or southeast (side facing) elevations of the extensions hereby approved without planning permission first obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of nearby 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 01 Party Walls Act
2. INFORMATIVE  
In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, The London Borough of Merton (LBM) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. LBM works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:
  - i) Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.
  - ii) Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
  - iii) As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

- i) The application was acceptable as submitted and no further assistance was required.

ii) The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

---

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load