

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
18th September 2014

Item No: 07

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

	14/P1832	27/05/2014
--	----------	------------

Address/Site: 14 Merton Hall Road, Wimbledon, London, SW19 3PP

(Ward) Dundonald

Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension

Drawing Nos: 1333/PL.01, PL.02(A), 03(B), 1333/GA.01, 04, 05, 07 & 08

Contact Officer: David Gardener (0208 545 3115)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: No
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 6
- External consultations: No
- Number of jobs created: N/A

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought before the Planning Applications Committee for determination because it has been called in by Councillor Grocott.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two-storey semi-detached house, which is located on the southwest side of Merton Hall Road, Wimbledon.
- 2.2 The house has a traditional appearance and features a two-storey front bay and gable roof, which addresses the street. An existing detached garage is located in the rear garden.
- 2.3 The site is not located in a conservation area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The applicant seeks planning permission to erect a single storey rear and side extension. The extension would accommodate an open plan kitchen/dining/living area at the rear and garage to the side.
- 3.2 The extension would have a contemporary appearance, featuring a flat roof, which steps up slightly at the rear. The rear elevation would be fully glazed with the flank walls comprising white render. A render canopy with zinc flashings would enclose the rear and northwest facing side elevations.
- 3.3 The extension as originally submitted had a depth of 6.5m when measured from the main rear wall of the house and 2.75m when measured from the rear wall of the two-storey wing. The maximum height of the extension has since been reduced from 3.4m to 3.15m with the roof also now stepping down from 3.15m to 2.85m in height 70cm from the extensions north facing flank wall.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 MER201/73 - Conversion to two self-contained flats and detached garage at rear. Granted - 13/04/1973
- 4.2 02/P0048 - Erection of a two-storey side extension to 12 Merton Hall Road (on part of land within curtilage of 14 Merton Hall Road) incorporating a garage at ground floor level. Refused - 17/05/2002
- 4.3 13/P1764 - Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed conversion of 2 x self-contained flats into a single dwellinghouse. Issued - 26/07/2013

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 The following policies from the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014):

DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments)
DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings)
- 5.2 The following Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is also relevant: Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 Standard 21-day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers. In response two letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are as follows:

- Loss of daylight/sunlight
- Visually intrusive and overbearing
- Loss of outlook
- Impact on character and appearance of street scene
- Loss of privacy
- Design is not in keeping with existing property and poor use of materials
- Impact on air quality

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.11 The main planning considerations concern the design of the proposed extension and its impact on residential amenity.

7.2 Visual Amenity

7.21 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that extensions to buildings should respect and complement the design and detailing of the existing building. Policy DM D2 also states that extensions should respect the form, scale, bulk, and proportions of the original building.

7.22 It is considered that the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of its size. The extension would extend a rather modest 2.75m from the rear wall of the two-storey wing and would retain a sizeable gap with the side boundary with No.12 Merton Hall Road.

7.23 The existing house has a traditional appearance with a two-storey front bay, gable roof which addresses the street, and brick facing materials. The proposed extension would have a contemporary design, which is designed to contrast from the existing house rather than simply blend in. The contrasting style of a contemporary addition to a traditional building can, if carried out sympathetically be an acceptable design solution, and can have a positive impact on the appearance of the building. In this instance the extension is also single storey, which means there is more scope to have this type of extension given its lower profile.

7.24 The side element which accommodates the proposed garage would be visible from the street. It is considered that its contemporary appearance is acceptable given it is set back 2.8m from the front elevation of the house and given its relatively low height would have a limited impact on the architectural integrity of the house or on views from the street.

7.25 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would be of a size and design that respects the character and proportions of the original building and

surrounding context, whilst preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore accord with policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

7.3 Residential Amenity

7.31 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) state that proposals should ensure for provision of appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight and privacy, whilst protecting existing development from visual intrusion.

7.32 No.12

There is substantial screening along much of the side boundary and the extension would not project beyond the rear wall of the rear wing at this property, which means there would be very limited visibility of the extension when viewed from the rear garden. It is noted that the extension would be quite prominent when viewed from land to the side of the rear wing given the lower height of the boundary treatment on this part of the side boundary. On the advice of Council Officers the maximum height of the extension has been reduced by 25cm to 3.15m and steps down a further 30cm to 2.85m, 70cm from the north facing flank wall. It is considered that the extension would not be excessive in terms of its size, which combined with a gap of between 1.3m and 1.8m between the extension and the side boundary and the higher ground levels at No.12 (approx. 30cm) means it would not be visually intrusive, overbearing or result in an unacceptable level of privacy loss. The extension also passes the Council's Aspect Value Test, which means it would not have an unacceptable impact on daylight/sunlight levels.

7.33 No.16

It is not considered that the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of No.16 Merton Hall Road as the rear wall would not project beyond the rear wall of the single storey extension at this property.

7.34 The proposal would therefore accord with policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

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

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 It is considered that the proposed single storey rear and side extension, would be of a size and design that respects the form, scale, bulk, and proportions of the original building, and would not have a detrimental impact on views from the street. It is also considered that the proposal would not be visually

intrusive, overbearing or result in an unacceptable level of daylight/sunlight loss or privacy at adjoining properties. The proposal would therefore accord with policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development for full application)
2. B.3 (External materials as specified)
3. C.8 (No use of flat roof)
4. 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:
 - Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.
 - Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
 - As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

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

This page is intentionally left blank