


**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 14 DECEMBER 2006**

**06/2008/HOT  
65 CHRISTCHURCH ROAD  
EAST SHEEN**

**EAST SHEEN WARD  
Contact Officer  
A Wilson**



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames  
LA 100019441[2006].'- Do not scale'

**Proposal:** Construction of swimming pool extension to rear

**Applicant:** Clarke Desai Architects for Miss C. Denis

**Application Received:** 15 June 2006

**Main Development Plan Policies:**  
BLT 2, 4, 11, 15, 16, ENV 9.

**Present Use:** Single family dwelling.

**Site, History and Proposal:** The application refers to a 4 storey detached house on the south side of Christchurch Road close to the junction with Fife Road. This is in the Christchurch Road Conservation Area and is a Building Of Townscape Merit. The lower floor is at semi-basement level and at the rear, relies on an area of extensive excavation so as to obtain an aspect on to the rear garden. There is a rear conservatory at (upper) ground level. The main garden area is approximately 1.8m higher than the semi-basement floor level. The garden borders 5 other gardens in Christchurch and Fife Roads.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE – 14 DECEMBER 2006**

### History

81/132 – Erect part 3 storey, part single storey rear extension. Approved.

91/0412/FUL – Rear conservatory. Approved.

06/0341/HOT – Construction of swimming pool extension. Withdrawn following discussions with officers.

### Proposal

This application bears many similarities to the withdrawn application 06/0341/HOT. When submitted it was proposing the construction of a 13m deep by 5.7m wide extension containing a swimming pool. It would be attached to the rear of the existing extension and would be sited on the eastern side of the plot abutting the boundaries to the gardens at 63 and 61 Christchurch Road. A further 4.5m depth behind the swimming pool would be paved. The swimming pool extension would be flat roofed and 2.1m above ground level. A fence to the same height would be erected on the adjoining side boundary. The extension would be built in brick to match the existing building with glazing to the rear and high level glazing on the west facing elevation.

**Public and Other Representations:** One letter has been received from a neighbour objecting to:

1. Loss of trees;
2. Loss of privacy;
3. Loss of light;
4. Noise from swimming pool;
5. Visual appearance of structure in garden

**Amendments:** Swimming pool plant room re-located from below garden level at the rear of the pool to inside the house.

**Re-consultation:** No replies

**Further Amendments:**

- Omission of patio and re-grading of garden to rear of swimming pool;
- Swimming pool extension dimensions reduced to 11m by 5.7m

**Re-consultation:** Any further representations will be reported orally to members.

**Professional Comments:**

### Neighbour amenity

The swimming pool structure, if considered as a rear extension, would at 11m be considerably in excess of the Guideline indicator of 4m for detached houses. However, the flat roof structure would be 2.1m above ground level and would be bordered by a 2.1m high fence along the dividing boundary with the neighbours at 61 and 63 Christchurch Road. As a boundary fence could be erected along the boundary under permitted development at a height of 2m, the difference in the visual appearance or daylight from the neighbouring property's garden would be negligible. The withdrawn application (ref. 06/0341/HOT) had proposed a 2.3m high and 13m long swimming pool structure. There would be no windows overlooking neighbouring properties and a condition can be imposed preventing use of the roof for sitting etc. Despite the neighbour's objection based on noise, it is not usual planning practice to place a restriction on facilities or seek to control activities within a single family dwelling context.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE – 14 DECEMBER 2006**

### Design

The swimming pool structure's modern block form would differ from the more sober design style of the existing Building of Townscape Merit, but being to the rear, it would not be visible from any public viewpoints or harmful to the character of the existing building.

### Trees

Concerns were raised by the arboricultural officer that the plans for the underground swimming room plant and rear patio would sever roots of a yew tree in a neighbouring garden. However, with the submission of amended plans this problem has been addressed and the swimming pool would not pose a threat to the tree subject to a condition requiring protective fencing during construction.

**Conclusion:** The structure would not have any significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, or threaten the retention of the neighbouring yew tree, and would not adversely affect the character of the existing Building of Townscape Merit.

I therefore recommend **PERMISSION**, subject to the following conditions and informatives:

#### **Standard Conditions:**

- AT01 - Development 3 years
- BD09A - Brickwork to match existing.
- GD01 - Restriction on use of roof
- LA22 - Protective fencing – Other Sites, insert “(the yew tree abutting the site boundary at 61 Christchurch Road)” after “all trees to be retained”

#### **Non standard conditions:**

- NS01 - The boundary fencing indicated on the drawings hereby approved shall not exceed 2.1 metres height, and shall continue to be so maintained. REASON: To protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers

#### **Standard Informatives:**

- IE05A - Noise control - building sites
- IH06B - Damage to public highway
- IL10 - Building Regulations
- IL12A - Approved drawing numbers: CC PRO ~~001B/002C/003B/004C/006B/007C~~ received 21 November 2006 and CC PRO ~~005A~~ received 15 June 2006.
- IL16H - Proposals and Policies: UDP Policies BLT 2,4,11,15, 16, ENV 9.
- IL19 - Reasons to approve – see conclusion

#### **Background Papers:**

Application forms and drawings ref. 06/0341/HOT  
Letters of representation

---

