

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 26 SEPTEMBER 2019

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
19/P2414	24/06/2019
Address/Site	22 West Side Common, Wimbledon, SW19 4UF
Ward	Village
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, excavation of basement and a single storey garage.
Drawing Nos	FP06, 19051-TW-400 Revision B2, EX01, FP01, FP02, FP03, FP04, FP05, FP07, FP08, FP09, FP10, FP11, CCL 10193/TPP Revision 1, CCL 10193/TCP Revision 2, CCL 10193/IAP Revision 2, CCL 10193 /TPP Revision 1, Heritage Statement June 2019, Ground Movement Assessment Ref: 17646/GMA June 2019, Construction Engineer's Method Statement and SuDS Strategy for Planning (including Basement Impact Assessment) Ref: 19051/CMS- June 2019 rev P2, For PLANNING, Heritage Statement (June 2019) BS 5837 Arboricultural Report Impact Assessment and Method Statement, Tree Schedule
Contact Officer:	Charlotte Gilhooly (020 8545 4028)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 15
- External consultations: 2
- Controlled Parking Zone: No

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications Committee for consideration in light of the number of objections received.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The site comprises a double storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the west side of Wimbledon Common. The site is within West Wimbledon Conservation Area and Wimbledon Common Archaeological Priority Tier 2. A single storey modern garage is sited to the south of the original dwelling. The property has a large brick front wall which provides privacy at the front of the site. 22 West Side Common and 22a West Side Common was originally constructed as one dwelling, however, have been subdivided, separated centrally. The dwelling on the subject site is locally listed. The character assessment states:

“This is a two storey building which is thought to date from the eighteenth century, or possibly even earlier, but which certainly pre dates 1867. Its architectural style shows Dutch classical influence. The materials used include render and roof tiles. The design of the building does not relate closely to that of other buildings in the area. The most notable features of interest include the double pile hipped roof, the wrought ironwork to some of the first floor windows, and the general proportions of the casement windows. There have been some modifications to the building, including the removal of some chimneys and the use of new roof materials.”

The surrounding area is characterised by substantial semi-detached and detached dwellings, with generous sized rear and side gardens which look out onto Wimbledon Common.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing single storey garage, the construction of a double storey side extension, a single storey rear extension, a basement and a single storey detached garage.

- 3.1 The proposal will have the following dimensions:
- Two storey side extension: 6.16m wide, (7.56m including rear bay window) 9.97m deep with an eaves height of 5.91m and a maximum roof height of 7.91m. The architectural style of the extension would mimic that of the original dwelling, however, will be minimally setback and lowered. There are proposed to be four new front windows, eleven side windows and four rear windows. This extension will have a similar footprint as the existing ground floor side garage.
 - The basement will be 9.51m wide at the south end, 9.68m wide at the north end, 9.47m deep and 2.99m high.
 - The free standing outbuilding/garage will be located at the front of the site and will be 4.85m wide, 9.3m deep and 2.32m high up to the eaves with a maximum roof height of 3.96m. This garage will occupy one car, with a shed contained at the end. The roof will match the existing dwelling material, while the walls will be white painted timber clad and the door will be oak.

- The single storey rear extension will be 3.47m wide, 5.64m deep with an eaves height of 2.81m and a maximum roof height of 4.32m. An open court yard will be located on the north east side.
- A white timber framed gate to allow vehicles on site will be 2m high and 2.74m wide.

3.2 Materials

The roof will be finished in reclaimed red clay hung tiles and chimney pots to match the existing. The walls will be painted render to match the existing. Proposed windows will be a mixture of timber framed box sash windows and timber framed casement windows.

No refuse storage is shown on the plans.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- WIM1836: private garage – permission granted.
- WIM2095: alterations into 2 houses - permission granted.
- WIM2436: application for the erection of 1 dwelling house within the curtilage of one of the 2 houses formed by application wim2095 – permission refused.
- 02/P1714: application for a certificate of lawfulness in respect of proposed rooms in roof space with rear dormer - issue certificate of lawfulness.

5. **CONSULTATION**

5.1 Consultation letters were sent to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

5.1.1 In response to the consultation, six letters of representation have been received. The summary of representations are as follows:

5.2 External:

5.2.1 Character

- This is a very large extension which will exacerbate the existing massing at 22, 22A and 23 West Side Common which form an uninterrupted block. This is out of place with other West Side Common residential properties.
- Concern about the potential damage the excavation and piling will cause to the mature Sycamore tree, the water table and disturbance caused by piling to neighbouring properties.
- The total size of the completed scheme will be much larger than most of the properties on West Side Common.
- The siting of the garage is very close to the boundary and would therefore make the garage visible from the street. By having the garage so close it would spoil views from the street and Wimbledon Common. If the garage was rotated 90 degrees or sited a metre away from the boundary wall the problem could be resolved.

5.2.2 Amenity

- It will obscure our views of the common from the first floor window (22A West Side Common).
- The flat roofed passageway connecting the proposed new gym, even though the plan shows it will be constructed mainly in glass, would not prohibit any inhabitants from obscuring the glass which would further compromise our right to light.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the amount of light entering my kitchen window. (22A West Side Common).

5.2.3 Construction

- The proposed basement could cause damage to the foundations of 20B 20C, 20D, 21 and 22A as well as the mature Sycamore tree and old wall on the site.
- Whatever extension is approved, there should be safeguards in place to limit noise levels and disturbance during construction.
- Arrangements will need to be put in place in order to avoid obstructing West Side Common during the construction period.
- The proposal will cause excessive disruption to local residents because of increased heavy duty lorries carting away heavy spoils from the site. The area already suffers from heavy traffic.

5.3 Internal:

5.3.1 Tree Officer

The proposed development requires the removal of a moderate quality apple and Japanese Maple. Both trees have been given a 'C' category rating and are relatively insignificant in the local area. A third tree is proposed for removal due to the presence of significant decay through the main stems;

The arboricultural report sets out a satisfactory level of protection for all the trees, including those located in the green verge outside of this property.

Should you be minded to recommend a grant of planning permission for this development, then I would advise attaching the following planning conditions: (see below.)

5.3.2 Conservation Officer

- Concerns over the siting of the proposed garage and should be repositioned. The design is ok.
- Preference would be not to see the bay windows on the side. The internal gain does not outweigh the harm to the proposed extension.
- The lightwells are overly large and eat into the garden. If the bay is removed they can reduce the size of the light well to the basement bedroom. If they must have garden access to the basement I recommend that it is soft landscaped to become part of the garden.
- I am not sure of the purpose of the flat roof at first floor level.

5.3.4 Flood Risk Officer:

The dwelling is located in flood zone 1 and is not shown to be in a high or medium surface water flooding location.

A high level drainage strategy has been provided by Axiom Structures Limited to support the application, although some drainage calculations and indicative drainage layouts have been included as an appendix to the Soils Ltd Basement Impact Assessment.

Based upon the 4 No. boreholes at the nearby school relatively shallow groundwater conditions are anticipated. Groundwater was struck in the four boreholes at depths ranging between 1.75 and 4.00m bgl. And rose to standing depths ranging between 1.01 and 2.05m bgl. High groundwater levels can also be inferred from the presence of an unlined pond 250m east of the site (Rushmere Pond) which typically has a water level of around 1m bgl. This risk needs to be considered and mitigated, both during and post construction.

It appears that the proposed works will not increase permeable surfaces and will reduce the flow of surface water using SUDS techniques to no more than 4l/s for events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change allowance.

The drainage layout drawing shows a proposed soakaway in the rear garden and this should will need to be designed in accordance with BRE365, taking into account the potential for seasonal variation to occur particularly in winter and spring when high groundwater levels will exist.

If you are minded to approve this application, please include the following conditions: (see below).

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2019):

Part 12 Achieving well designed places

Part 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

6.2 London Plan Consolidated 2016:

- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology

6.3 Merton Sites and Policies Plan July 2014 policies:

- DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
- DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- DM D4 Managing Heritage assets

6.4 Merton Core Strategy 2011 policy:

CS 14 Design

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The planning considerations for an extension to an existing building relate to the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building along with the surrounding area and the impact upon neighbouring amenity.

Character and Appearance

7.2 London Plan policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2, DMD3 and DM D4 require well designed proposals that are of the highest architectural quality and incorporate a design that is appropriate to its context, so that development relates positively to the appearance, scale, bulk, form, proportions, materials and character of the original building and their surroundings, thus enhancing the character of the wider area. The site lies within the Conservation Area which seeks to protect the distinct character of the area and views from the Common. The host building is locally listed and thereby makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

7.2.1 **Basement**

Internally, the basement will be extended at the side of the property and the new basement will be excavated to allow for a sunken external courtyard. This will provide additional light into the proposed basement and provide an alternative access/escape route. As the basement does not take up more than 50% of the front, rear or side of the garden, the principle of the proposed basement is considered acceptable and compliant with policy DM D2.

The courtyard/lightwell to the side of the property would be a large addition and would be visible once you are inside the curtilage of the property but as this part of the proposal is at the side of the building and screened by a large wall, it would not be visible from the streetscene. On this basis the basement and courtyard is not considered to be detrimental in appearance towards the host dwelling or surrounding Conservation Area and is therefore considered acceptable. However as this area is Archaeological Area Tier 2, there is a potential for archaeological finds. As such a condition is recommended.

7.2.2 **Two storey side extension**

It is considered that the proportions and the footprint of the proposed two storey side extension are acceptable in the way that they relate to the host dwelling and the constraints of the site. The width of the extension would respect the width of the host dwelling and the host dwelling would remain the dominant part of the building on the site.

The two storey side extension would be set down from the existing roof ridge and maintain the same angle of pitch as the roof pitch of the main building creating a subordinate appearance. Windows will have the same proportions as existing. Materials include reclaimed terracotta tiles, timber framed

windows, reclaimed chimney pots and decorative black painted wrought iron railings to basement courtyard to match existing balustrade railings. As such this element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

In addition as the site benefits from a large garden at the side of the property, there would be a separation distance at the side boundary of approximately 17m. As such, this element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

7.2.3 Single storey rear extension

The single storey rear extension is traditional in style with a pitched roof and windows to match the existing building. In addition it is of a depth, scale and proportion and which is subordinate to the main building. In addition it will be in keeping with the appearance of the existing building and rear extension located at 22A West Side Common. This element of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.

7.2.4 Outbuilding

The outbuilding is of a scale, form and proportion which is not considered harmful to the character of the host building or surrounding Conservation Area.

While normally an outbuilding forward of the building line would be considered detrimental, it is considered that because it is largely screened by a high retaining wall, it would not be detrimental to the host building or surrounding Conservation Area.

7.2.5 Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding Conservation Area. The character of the Conservation Area would be preserved by the proposal.

8. Neighbouring Amenity

The properties which may be affected include 20b, 20c, 21 and 22A West Side Common

8.1 20b West Side Common

As most of the proposal is contained at the side elevation, the only part of the proposal which has the potential to affect the amenity of this neighbours property is the single storey rear extension. At 5.64m deep and 4.34m high combined with a separation distance of 19m, this element of the proposal is not considered to harm this neighbours amenity.

8.2 20C West Side Common

The two storey side extension would extend the build form across the side of the site and thereby increasing the potential for overlooking. But as there is a separation distance of approximately 11m and there are already windows at the two storey level in this orientation, it would not increase the amount of overlooking substantially to be considered harmful to this neighbours amenity.

8.3 21 West Side Common

The proposed two storey side extension would extend the built form closer to the boundary of this property but as the properties along this side of are north east facing and there would remain a separation distance of approximately 17m at the side boundary, the proposal is not considered to impact the amenity of this property.

8.4 22A West Side Common

This property adjoins 22 West Side Common. As such the only part of the proposal which could affect this neighbour's amenity is the single storey rear extension element.

8.5 It is noted the 22A has an existing single storey rear extension which has a window in the side elevation which looks out onto the rear garden/courtyard of 22 West Side Common. The proposed single storey rear extension adjoins the wall of this existing neighbouring extension. However as part of the design the applicant proposes an internal courtyard in order to allow light into this neighbouring property. As such and because the extension does not extend further than 22A's existing rear extension, this element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

8.6 Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable to the amenity of these neighbouring properties in terms of loss of day light/sunlight, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.

9 Parking

The proposal will not involve the loss of any car parking spaces. This element of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable. The proposed garage is positioned on site without affecting the highway.

10 Impact on Trees

The Council's Tree Officer has assessed the submitted information and has recommended the following conditions below. The 3 trees to be removed are not considered to be of visual significance to warrant their protection.

11. CONCLUSION

The scale, form, design, positioning and materials of the proposals are not considered to have an undue detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, the host building or on neighbouring amenity. Therefore, the proposal complies with the principles of policies DMD2, DMD3 and DM D4 of the Adopted SPP 2014, CS14 of the LBM Core Strategy 2011 and 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016. It is not considered that there are any other material considerations that would warrant refusal of this application.

It is therefore recommended to grant permission subject to conditions.

12. RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission

Subject to the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B1 External Materials to be approved
4. C03 Obscure Glazing
5. D11 Construction Times
6. E06 Ancillary Residential Accommodation
7. F01 Landscaping Planting Scheme
8. H01 Landscaping/planting scheme
9. H09 Construction Vehicles
10. Tree protection
11. Site supervision (trees)
12. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a detailed scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) via infiltration or at the agreed runoff rate (no more than 3.9l/s), in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

13. **Condition:** Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit a detailed construction method statement (CMS) produced by the respective contractor/s responsible for building the approved works, to the approval of the Local Planning Authority. The construction method statement shall also detail how drainage and groundwater, will be managed and mitigated during and post construction (permanent phase) such as through passive drainage measures around the basement structure.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

14. 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 organization 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.

Informatives:

1. 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.
2. No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. 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).
3. No waste material, including concrete, mortar, grout, plaster, fats, oils and chemicals shall be washed down on the highway or disposed of into the highway drainage system.

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