

Application reference: 20/1845/HOT EAST SHEEN WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
06.07.2020	07.07.2020	01.09.2020	01.09.2020

Site:

8 Wayside, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LN

Proposal:

First floor side extension, replacement porch and new outbuilding replacing three existing sheds, replacement windows and doors, re-rendering of external walls and re-cladding of existing rear dormer.

Status: Pending Consideration (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

APPLICANT NAME

Mr & Mrs Browne
8, Wayside
East Sheen
London
SW14 7LN

AGENT NAME

Thomas Evans
2 Mint Street
Godalming
GU7 1HE
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on and due to expire on

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

11 Wayside, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LN, - 08.07.2020
9 Wayside, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LN, - 08.07.2020
7 Wayside, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LN, - 08.07.2020
3 Christchurch Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AB, - 08.07.2020
1 Christchurch Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AB, - 08.07.2020
1A Christchurch Road, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AB, - 08.07.2020
10 Wayside, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LN, - 08.07.2020
6 Wayside, East Sheen, London, SW14 7LN, - 08.07.2020

History: Planning – Appeal – Enforcement – Building Control

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 01/0729
Date: 17/05/2001 Proposed Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 01/1906
Date: 08/11/2001 Single Storey Extension.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 02/0564
Date: 01/08/2002 Proposed Single Storey Extension.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 03/1199
Date: 03/06/2003 Proposed Single Storey Side And Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 05/0728/HOT

Date:05/05/2005 Demolition of garage and utility room and replacement with single storey side and rear extension with pitched roof to form bedsit accommodation. Replace porch. Changes to front/side boundary wall.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:16/2711/PS192
Date:09/09/2016 Alterations to the existing house and erection of a garden studio.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:20/1845/HOT
Date: First floor side extension, replacement porch and new outbuilding replacing three existing sheds, replacement windows and doors, re-rendering of external walls and re-cladding of existing rear dormer.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.04.2000 Loft conversion
Reference: 00/0747/FP

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.06.2005 New side and rear single storey extension
Reference: 05/1266/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.08.2011 Circuit alteration or addition in kitchen/ special location One or more new circuits
Reference: 11/NIC01991/NICEIC

Enforcement

Opened Date: 30.04.2002 Enforcement Enquiry
Reference: 02/00151/EN

Application reference: 20/1845/HOT
Address: 8 Wayside, East Sheen SW14 7LN

Proposal	First floor side extension, replacement porch and new outbuilding replacing three existing sheds, replacement windows and doors, re-rendering of external walls and re-cladding of existing rear dormer.
Site description / key designations	The subject site is currently occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling-house, located on the western side of Wayside. The site is not subject to any relevant planning designations.
Planning history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16/2711/PS192 - Alterations to the existing house and erection of a garden studio. Granted • 05/0728/HOT - Demolition of garage and utility room and replacement with single storey side and rear extension with pitched roof to form bedsit accommodation. Replace porch. Changes to front/side boundary wall. Granted • 03/1199/HOT - Proposed Single Storey Side And Rear Extension. Granted • 02/0564 - Proposed Single Storey Extension. Granted • 01/1906 - Single Storey Extension. Refused • 01/0729 - Proposed Rear Extension. Refused
Policies	<p>The proposal has been considered having regard to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Local Plan, in particular:</p> <p>Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality • LP 8 Residential Amenity and Living Conditions • LP 15 Biodiversity • LP 16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape <p>Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House extensions and external alterations (2015) • East Sheen Village Planning Guidance
Material representations	The application has been publicised in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order. No representations were received.
Amendments	No Amendments Received
Professional comments	<p>The application site has been visited and the proposal assessed in relation to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design / visual amenity • Neighbour amenity • Trees <p>Design / Visual Amenity</p> <p><i>Policy LP 1 'Local Character and Design Quality' states the Council will require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. The high-quality character and heritage of the borough and its villages will need to be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise. Development proposals will have to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local area. Development must respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character.</i></p> <p><u>Side extension</u></p> <p><i>Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (SPD) states that the overall shape, size and position of rear and side extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. This can be achieved through an extension is which integrated with the house which can work well with detached houses and sometimes on the end of uniform terraces. Alternatively extension can work by designing the addition to appear subordinate to the main structure so that the original form of the dwelling can still be appreciated.</i></p>

Regarding infilling of gaps, the SPD specifically states that development, which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two storey side extensions should be sited 1 m from the side boundary.

The proposed side extension has been designed to integrate with the existing dwelling as per SPD guidance above. It is noted that No.10 (the properties semi-detached pair) was approved an extension which is sited on the boundary and integrates with the property in 1984. No.10s extension has evidently been constructed and therefore in principle this type of extension could be appropriate on this site.

Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that the side extension proposed under this application has been design appropriately to integrate with the host dwelling. No.10 was approved a two-storey extension which incorporates a hipped roof. The roof proposed under this scheme has a gabled end, which would disrupt the symmetry between the pair. Whilst it is recognised that the properties are not currently symmetrical, the proposed side extension, which would be sited on the boundary exacerbates the unbalance between the pair and also intensifies the vertical and horizontal emphasis of the semi-detached properties as they relate to the street. The House Extensions SPD also discusses the importance of maintaining important visual gaps between dwellings. Whilst No.10 has an extension sited on the boundary it is appreciated that this extension was approved well before current policy, and that gaps have been maintained between properties in the immediate locality. Therefore it is considered appropriate that weight is given to current SPD guidance to avoid the closing of gaps between detached and semi-detached properties.

Further, an overhang of the first floor is proposed, with the ground floor remaining marginally recessed which is considered incongruous and at odds with the street scene.

Given the above, by reason of its combined siting, bulk and design the side extension would harm the appearance of the semi-detached pair as well as the character and appearance of the street. The scheme is thereby contrary to Local Plan Policy LP 1 as well as the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.

Roof Extensions

As the proposed side extension integrates with the host property, the gabled roof extends over the two-storey side extension. As explained above, the extended gabled roof creates greater horizontal and vertical emphasis to the host semi-detached pair and would create a scheme which appears out of scale and overly bulky.

The dormer extension, whilst quite large is not larger than existing and is therefore appropriate. However, the House Extensions SPD states that dormer windows should be smaller than the windows on the floor below. The proposed juliet balcony does not fit this criteria and is larger than the first floor fenestration. This exacerbates the bulk of the dormer and therefore is contrary to policy and would not be supported. The materials (proposed to be zinc cladding) also do not blend in with the main house and an objection is raised on this basis.

The proposed rooflights however are not uncharacteristic of the area and the proposal is not cluttered, as such are appropriate.

Rear Extension

The proposed rear extension would be subservient to the host dwelling as it sits below the first-floor fenestration. There are a variety of rear extensions in the locality and it is not considered that the proposal would be an alien feature.

Front Elevations Alterations

The House Extensions SPD states that porch additions should *'retain visual continuity, match existing work and also consider neighbouring properties'*.

The proposed porch is of a similar size to the existing, however it is proposed with a flat roof as opposed to the existing hipped roof which is also evident on several other porches in the locality. Although the porches in the locality are not identical, the hipped roof feature allows for a degree of continuity. The proposed flat roof to the porch would disrupt this thereby impacting the character of the street and the integrity of the property. It is noted that No.3 Wayside has a flat roofed front porch, however this was constructed under permitted development.

The windows proposed on the front elevation of the side extension, whilst are similar in size, are not similar in style. It is observed that the windows on all houses in the locality maintain consistent style and therefore the proposed fenestration disrupts the continuity and character of the host property and the street.

Given such the porch is contrary to Local Plan Policy LP 1 and the House Extensions SPD.

Outbuildings

The proposed outbuilding is in scale with the host dwelling in terms of coverage and height, and is proposed in materials which are considered appropriate.

Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP 8 states all development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. The principles of this policy are reiterated in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.

The proposed rear extension is not to project any further than existing and although the overall height will increase as a result of the proposal it is not considered that the extension would be overbearing nor result in an unreasonable loss of sunlight to either adjoining neighbours which would warrant a refusal. The windows to the rear extension are rearwards facing and therefore would not compromise neighbour privacy.

There are not side windows located on original building at No.6 and therefore it is not considered that the proposed two storey extension would be unreasonably overbearing to the property. Likewise, it is not considered that privacy would be compromised as a result of the side extension.

A dormer extension exists and therefore there would be no additional views afforded as a result of this.

The outbuilding is modest in size and is located to the rear of the property. It is sited at a distance from neighbouring properties that it would not be unreasonably overbearing nor cause sunlight impact. Had the scheme been considered acceptable the scheme could have been conditioned to ensure the outbuilding remained as an ancillary use to the host dwelling.

The changes to the front of the property would not cause amenity impact.

Trees

LP15 states *The Council will protect and enhance the borough's biodiversity, in particular, but not exclusively, the sites designated for their biodiversity and nature conservation value, including the connectivity between habitats.*

LP 16 States the Council will *resist the loss of trees, including aged or veteran trees, unless the tree is dead, dying or dangerous; or the tree is causing significant damage to adjacent structures; or the tree has little or no amenity value; or felling is for reasons of good arboricultural practice;*

The proposed plans show the removal of mature trees in the rear and front garden

	<p>areas as well as significantly altering the exiting soft landscaping.</p> <p>In the absence of any justification or further information, including a tree survey, an arboricultural impact statement and an arboricultural method, and satisfactory replacement planting and hard/soft landscaping plans the proposed alterations and removal of mature trees cannot be supported and is contrary to Local Plan Policies LP15 and LP16.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The proposed side extension, roof extension and dormer window by reason of thier combined siting, bulk, design, materials and fenestration would result in the loss of an inportant gap between buildings, creating a terracing effect and harm the appearance of the semi-detached pair as well as the character and appearance of the street. As such the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (adopted July 2018), in particular policies LP1 as well as the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.</p> <p>In the absence of an Arboricultural Impact assessment and replacement tree planting, the proposals would result in the loss of a mature tree to the detriment of the biodiversity, ecology and visual amenity of the locality. As such the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (adopted July 2018), in particular policies LP1, LP15 and LP 16.</p>
Recommendation	Refuse

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / NO

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable YES* NO
 (*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement YES* NO
 (*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)


This application has representations online (which are not on the file) YES NO

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials):DAV..... Dated:25/08/20.....

I agree the recommendation:

~~Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Senior Planner~~



Dated:27/08/2020.....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Head of Development Management:

Dated:

REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:
UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS

INFORMATIVES

U0045168	Decision drawing numbers ~~
U0045167	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42