

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

17th September 2015

Item No:

UPRN	APPLICATION NO.	DATE VALID
	15/P2510	24.06.2015

Address/Site 87 Cottenham Park Road, West Wimbledon, SW20 0DR

(Ward) Raynes Park

Proposal:

Partial demolition and rebuilding of the existing property to create a new three storey house including the conversion of garage into a summerhouse.

Drawing Nos; Site location plan and drawings 179/RPA/09, 179/RPA/10, 179/RPA/11, 179/RPA/12, 179/RPA/13, 179/RPA/14, 179/RPA/15, 179/RPA/16, 179/RPA/17, 179/RPA/18, 179/RPA/19, 179/RPA/20 & 179/RPA/21.

Contact Officer: Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)

RECOMMENDATIONS

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
- Design Review Panel consulted: Yes,
- Number of neighbours consulted: 9
- Press notice – No
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: No
- Archaeological Priority Zone – No
- Controlled Parking Zone - No
- Number of jobs created: N/A

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Committee due to the level of public interest.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The site is located on the south side of Cottenham Park Road opposite Hill View. The property is a small detached two storey house designed in a 'Dutch'

style with a shared access to garages to the rear. The house sits amongst a series of very large detached and semidetached Edwardian houses whilst the opposite side of the road is characterised by 1970s era modern housing. The site is not located within a Conservation Area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposed works to the main house would involve the partial demolition of the existing house and works that would extend its length and height to provide a modern three storey house.
- 3.2 On the ground floor the front of the new house would retain a front part width protrusion for a study but the existing bay window will be replaced with new flush fenestration. The main entrance would be relocated to the side of the house via the shared drive. Beyond this point the rebuild would extend the building across the full width of the site to the side boundary and rearwards by 3.4m beyond the existing rear elevation. This rear ground floor area would be utilised as an open plan kitchen/dining and family room space with doors out to the rear garden.
- 3.3 Stairs leading up the first floor access two bathrooms, two single bedrooms, a double bedroom and an ensuite master bedroom to the rear. This master bedroom would be situated within a 3.8m deep rear extension with a rear facing Juliette balcony. Apart from that rearwards extension, the first floor would follow the footprint of the existing house such that the increased width of the house at ground floor level was not replicated at first floor level. The new first floor fenestration serving the hallways and new rear ensuite would be obscure glazed.
- 3.4 The stairs would lead up to the new second floor area which will provide a guest bedroom and a further ensuite bedroom internally as well as enclosed terrace spaces on both the front and rear elevations with the rear terrace overlooking the first floor green roof and features glass privacy screens on each side. The roof would be flat and feature solar panels and a glazed lantern skylight.
- 3.5 The design of the external materials reflects comments from the Design Review Panel and drawings 179/RPA/13 & 14 show the palette of grey/brown facing brick, red brown porcelain stone cladding and small sections of render and stained timber cladding.
- 3.6 A decked terrace will link the rear of the house to the new summerhouse which replaces the existing garage. This single storey structure will be no higher than the existing garage and feature a pebble topped flat roof and glazed doors out to the terrace. A self contained store area would be provided within a timber clad area at the rear of the building.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 14/P0837 Planning permission refused and appeal dismissed for erection of a two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, front(side) roof extension with alteration in roof materials and windows, and conversion of garage into a summerhouse.
Reason; The proposals by reason of size, design, massing and siting would be both visually prominent and unduly dominant, would fail to respect of complement the design of the original building or use materials that would be sympathetic to its surroundings to the detriment of the visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers and would be contrary to policies BE.15 and BE.23 of the Merton Unitary Development Plan (October 2003).
- 4.2 MER482/84 - Single storey extension at side - Grant - 13/07/1984
- 4.3 WIM7294 - Garage - Grant - 20/02/1964
- 4.4 WIM6718 - House, formation of a common driveway between the proposed and existing house - Grant - 14/03/1963
- 4.5 WIM5898(D) - Erection of 2 storey house with garage - Refused - 06/04/1962.
- 4.6 WIM5898(O) - House, 2 garages - Grant - 14/09/1961

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by means of a site notice and letters to 9 neighbouring occupiers. In response to the consultations 7 objections were received raising the following concerns:
- The flat roof and choice of materials are unsympathetic to neighbouring Edwardian houses and the existing house
 - Visually prominent and unduly dominant
 - Harmful to visual amenity
 - The second floor rear balcony causes loss of privacy
 - The rear of the building will project beyond the established building line, the upper floor in particular
 - Conversion and extension of the garage will increase disturbance
 - The size of the 'summerhouse' would create an unsightly large box causing loss of visual amenity
 - The size of the building will result in loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 Prior to the submission of the application the proposals were presented to the Design Review Panel who gave the proposal an Amber light and made the following comments;
"The Panel were clearly supportive of the applicant's approach to create a single new house in a consistent contemporary style. The site analysis and proposed layout appeared a sensible and neat solution that was an improvement on the existing layout and should work well. The Panel

however, were also clear that the applicant needed to do further work to explain and demonstrate thoroughly and clearly the suitability of the proposed design. This needed to be done both in terms of responding to the issues raised by the appeal decision and in terms of the forthcoming planning application.

The applicant needed to show that they have fully addressed the issues raised in the appeal as this is a material planning consideration in a future planning application. It was also important to more thoroughly and methodically justify the design in terms of the setting and in terms of the detail of the design – why the design is the way it is and how it evolved to that point, and how it takes design references from its setting. The applicant must show the thought and logic that has gone into the choice of proportion and form of the various elements of the building. It must show it respects the wider setting as this is part of demonstrating it is good design.

The Panel felt that it was important to aid understanding of the proposal by means of both an elevation of the wider section of the street and by 3D images, whether axonometric or CGI, and that a model would be even better. The building cannot just talk to itself – it must address and relate well to its setting. Responding to practical issues and constraints are not sufficient a justification for a particular design.

The Panel had a few concerns about some aspects of the design. There was a general point about ensuring privacy for neighbours was maintained (no privacy screens were shown to the terraces) and that the outlook from the two side bedrooms was acceptable. The Panel noted that the applicant showed metal cladding systems yet the appeal inspector was critical of these. They also guarded against the use of render as it is very difficult to ensure it gave a quality feel in the long term.

The applicant needed to provide more and clearer information on the colour and texture to be used and fully explain and justify this. The Panel also noted that the boundary treatment at the front had not been addressed and should be considered as part of the overall design – similar to the way the rear garden had been included. The new application needed to justify the design in terms of the Council's recently adopted planning policies. It also needs to be clear whether the application is for an extension or a new-build and therefore which policies apply.

VERDICT: **AMBER**"

- 5.4 These matters were addressed by the applicants prior to the submission of this application and the terraces now have screening panels proposed, the metal cladding systems and widescale use of render have been abandoned in favour of what are considered more appropriate materials.

6 POLICY CONTEXT

- 6.1 Relevant policies in the London Plan 2015 are; 3.3 (Increasing housing supply), 3.4 (Optimising housing potential), 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments), 3.8 (Housing choice), 5.3 (Sustainable design and construction), 5.7 (Renewable energy), 5.13 (Sustainable drainage) & 7.6(Architecture).

London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2012

NPPF 2012

- 6.2 Relevant policies in the Core Strategy 2011 are; CS8 (Housing choice), CS 13 (Open Space, Nature conservation), CS 14 (Design), CS 15 (Climate change) & CS 20 Parking, Servicing & delivery
- 6.3 The relevant policies in the Sites and Policies Plan 2014 are DM D1 (Urban Design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D3: (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings), DM H2 Housing mix, DM T2 Transport impacts of development & DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main planning considerations in this case relate to principle of development, the scale and design of the new house and the impact on neighbouring amenity and the appearance of the wider area.

7.2 Principle

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, London Plan 2015 policies 3.3 and the Council's Core Strategy policy CS9 all seek to increase sustainable housing provision where it can be shown that an acceptable standard of accommodation will also provide a mix of dwelling types. The use of the site for residential purposes is already well established.

7.3 Impact on the street scene.

Core strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policy DMD3 require well designed proposals that will respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of the original building and its surroundings. London plan 2015 policy 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP policies DM D1 and DM D2 require well designed proposals to utilise materials and design that will respect the siting, rhythm, materials and massing of surrounding buildings as well as complementing, responding to and reinforcing, local architectural character, locally distinctive patterns of development as well as the character and local distinctiveness of the adjoining townscape.

- 7.4 Whilst there is an existing Edwardian character to the majority of the houses and buildings on this side of Cottenham Park Road, the existing house which is a far later addition (1980s), does not share that character either in terms of its heritage and appearance or its scale, bulk and massing, being far smaller

than the surrounding properties. The proposed modern design approach has been supported by the DRP whose recommendations have been incorporated by the applicant into this design. In determining the previous appeal, the Inspector, despite dismissing the appeal, did comment that he had 'no objection to the principle of modern changes to individual properties.' The use of materials such as dark grey slates, a GRP Facia and stainless steel and zinc cladding panels was not supported by the Inspector and these are design elements that are not incorporated into this design. In view of these factors and the changes that have been adopted to address the Inspector and the DRP's concerns, the overall design and choice of materials is considered acceptable in these particular circumstances.

7.5 Impact on neighbour amenity.

London Plan policy 7.6, and Sites and Policies Plan policy DM D2 require proposals not to have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers through loss of light, overshadowing, outlook, privacy, visual intrusion or disturbance. A number of objections were received relating the impact of the proposal on neighbour amenity;

7.7 Loss of light;

At the first and second floor levels the building will be no closer to the neighbouring properties than the existing building. Although it would be higher and longer than the existing building it would still be separated from the neighbouring houses by the shared driveway and by the space to the rear of the garage at 85 such that it is considered that this would not justify grounds for refusal of the application.

7.8 Loss of privacy;

The new windows in the flank elevations would be obscure glazed whilst the inclusion of glazed privacy screens on each side of the rear terrace are design elements intended to protect neighbour privacy.

7.9 Noise and disturbance

The existing garage could be converted to another form of outbuilding use without the need for planning permission and consequently the use as a summerhouse is not considered to increase noise and disturbance. A condition requiring the use to remain ancillary to the use of the main house could be added to ensure it did not become a separate unit of accommodation which was a concern for a neighbour.

7.10 Suitability of accommodation.

Core Strategy policy CS 9 calls for the provision of well-designed housing and The London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2012 and the London Plan 2015 policy 3.5 set out a number of required design criteria for new residential developments including room and space standards. This proposal provides a generously proportioned house which meets all minimum room and amenity space standards and is therefore in accordance with those policies.

7.11 Trees.

Core strategy policy CS13 and SPP policy DM O2 seek to protect landscape features such as trees. The Council's trees officer raised no objection to the proposal subject to suitable conditions to ensure the protection of the trees on site.

7.12 Climate change mitigation and sustainable development:

On 25th March the Government issued a statement setting out steps it is taking to streamline the planning system. Relevant to the proposals, the subject of this application, are changes in respect of sustainable design and construction, energy efficiency and forthcoming changes to the Building Regulations. The Deregulation Act was given Royal Assent on 26th March. Amongst its provisions is the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

7.13 Until amendments to the Building Regulations come into effect the government expects local planning authorities not to set conditions with requirements above a Code level 4 equivalent. Where there is an existing plan policy which references the Code for Sustainable Homes, the Government has also stated that authorities may continue to apply a requirement for a water efficiency standard equivalent to the new national technical standard.

7.14 In light of the government's statement and changes to the National Planning Framework it is recommended that conditions are attached so as to ensure the development is designed and constructed to achieve CO2 reduction standards and water consumptions standards equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes level 4.

7.14 Parking and Access

Core Strategy policy CS 20 and policy DM T2 in the Sites and Policies Plan require developers to demonstrate that their development will not adversely affect safety, the convenience of local residents or on street parking and traffic management. The proposal will not increase the number of units on site and will still have on street parking in front of the building. However given the confined nature of the site and the potential for the lengthy demolition and construction process to impact the amenity of residents a condition requiring a construction method statement is recommended.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

The application site is less than 0.5 hectares in area and therefore falls outside the scope of Schedule 2 development under The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. In this context there is no requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment as part of this planning application.

London Plan policy 5.3 seeks a high standard of sustainable design and construction and inclusion of means of generating energy from renewable sources as part of new housing developments.

9. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal will effectively replace a detached house which is smaller and of a different design to its immediate neighbours with a larger more modern house small and a larger summer house in place of the existing garage.

The objections have focused on three issues, appearance, loss of privacy and loss of light. The applicants are considered to have addressed concerns raised by both the Planning Inspector and the Design Review Panel and designed a modern family home and summerhouse that represent a complimentary contrast to the existing and surrounding houses whilst the loss of privacy can be addressed by means of privacy screens and loss of light is mitigated by the separation distances between the relevant sites.

In view of these factors officers considered that the proposals are acceptable and will not have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the area or upon neighbour amenity and the proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Grant planning permission subject to conditions;

- 1 Commencement of works
- 2 In accordance with plans; Site location plan and drawings 179/RPA/09, 179/RPA/10, 179/RPA/11, 179/RPA/12, 179/RPA/13, 179/RPA/14, 179/RPA/15, 179/RPA/16, 179/RPA/17, 179/RPA/18, 179/RPA/19, 179/RPA/20 & 179/RPA/21.
- 3 B1 External materials to be approved; No development shall take place until details of particulars and samples of the materials to be used on all external faces of the development hereby permitted, including window frames and doors, windows and tiles (notwithstanding any materials specified in the application form and/or the approved drawings), have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.
- 4 D11 No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

- 5 H9 The development shall not commence until details of the provision to accommodate all site workers', visitors' and construction vehicles, loading /unloading and storage arrangements of construction plant and materials during the construction process have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

- 6 F5 Tree protection plan No development [including demolition] pursuant to this consent shall commence until an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, drafted in accordance with the recommendations and guidance set out in BS 5837:2012 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details have been installed. The details and measures as approved shall be retained and maintained, until the completion of all site operations.

- 7 F7 Trees notification of start The Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer shall be informed of the proposed commencement of works on site by a minimum of two weeks' notice.

- 8 F10 Tree protection No demolition or site works shall commence until details of construction exclusion zones to include the protection of the retained trees identified in the Tree Survey Plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details are fully in place. Any building construction outside of the construction exclusion zone, but within an area identified for root protection, shall be protected using ground protection as detailed in BS 5837:2012, or as required by the Local Planning Authority. The details, as approved shall be retained and maintained until the completion of all site operations.

- 9 F 8 site supervision (trees) The details of the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to monitor and report to the Local Planning Authority not less than fortnightly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

- 10 NPPF informative.

- 11 You are advised that this approval does not confer or imply to confer approval for the works to be implemented under any law or enactment other than the Town and Country Planning Acts.

This page is intentionally left blank