

Application reference: 20/2509/HOT
BARNES WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
09.09.2020	09.09.2020	04.11.2020	04.11.2020

Site:

12 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA

Proposal:

Demolition of existing conservatory. Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. Replacement boundary walls. Replacement garage door.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Stavros Samartis
12 Heidegger Crescent
Barnes
London
SW13 8HA

AGENT NAME

Mr Grahame Elton
18C Notting Hill Gate
London
W11 3JE

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

13 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA, - 09.09.2020
11 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA, - 09.09.2020
2 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA, - 09.09.2020
16 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA, - 09.09.2020
14 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA, -

History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:

Development Management

Status: REF

Date: 04/06/2020

Application: 20/1178/HOT

Demolition of existing conservatory. Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. Rear dormer roof extension and 2 no. rooflights on front roof slope. Replacement boundary walls.

Development Management

Status: REF

Date: 28/08/2020

Application: 20/2380/PS192

Rear dormer roof extension and 2 No. front skylights.

Development Management

Status: PDE

Date:

Application: 20/2509/HOT

Demolition of existing conservatory. Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. Replacement boundary walls. Replacement garage door.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 07.02.1996

Erection of 43 houses and 159 flats and associated works Now known as: 1-

18 (incl) Gilbert House, 44 Trinity Church Road, Barnes. SW13 8EG. 1-18 (incl) Doyle House, 46 Trinity Church Road, Barnes. SW13 8ED. 1-18 (incl) Caldwell House, 48 Trinity Church Road, Barnes. SW13 8EJ. 1-18 (incl) Clayton House, 50 Trinity Church Road, Barnes. SW13 8EL. 85,87,89,91 - Wyatt Drive, Barnes. SW13 8AN. 1-15 (incl) Heidegger Crescent, Barnes. SW13 8HA. 1-39 (incl) Holst Mansions, 96 Wyatt Drive, Barnes. SW13 8AJ. 1-39 (incl) Handel Mansions, 94 Wyatt Drive, Barnes. SW13 8AH. 1-9 (incl) Garraway Court, 92 Wyatt Drive, Barnes. SW13 8AG. 80,82,84,86,88,90 - Wyatt Drive, Barnes. SW13 8AB. 1-9 Burges Grove, Barnes. SW13 8BG. 21,23,25,27 Devereux Lane, Barnes. SW13 8DB. 22,24,26,28 Devereux Lane, Barnes. SW13 8DA.

Reference: 96/0091/FP

Application reference: 20/2509/HOT

Address: 12 Heidegger Crescent, Barnes, London, SW13 8HA

Proposal	Demolition of existing conservatory. Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. Replacement boundary walls. Replacement garage door.																																			
Site description / key designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal site is a three-storey, terraced dwelling, located on the northern side of Heidegger Crescent. The application site is subject to the following planning constraints: <table border="1" data-bbox="411 362 1428 1435"> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 362 730 497">Area Benefiting Flood Defence - Environment Agency</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 362 1428 497">Areas Benefiting from Defences</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 497 730 600">Article 4 Direction Basements</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 497 1428 600">Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 600 730 672">Floodzone 2</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 600 1428 672">Tidal Models</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 672 730 743">Floodzone 3</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 672 1428 743">Tidal Models</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 743 730 815">Land Use Past Industrial</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 743 1428 815">Engine House. Start: 1930 End: 1950</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 815 730 918">Protected View (Indicative Zone)</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 815 1428 918">View 7 RICHMOND PARK TOWARDS ST PAULS CATHEDRAL</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 918 730 1021">SFRA Zone 3a High Probability</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 918 1428 1021">Flood Zone 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 1021 730 1155">Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Zone 2 Medium Probability</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 1021 1428 1155"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 1155 730 1227">Village</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 1155 1428 1227">Barnes Village</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 1227 730 1361">Village Character Area</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 1227 1428 1361">Barnes Waterside and the London Wetlands Centre - Character Area 3 Barnes Village Planning Guidance Page 25 CHARAREA04/03/01</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="411 1361 730 1435">Ward</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="730 1361 1428 1435">Barnes Ward</td> </tr> </table>			Area Benefiting Flood Defence - Environment Agency	Areas Benefiting from Defences		Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018		Floodzone 2	Tidal Models		Floodzone 3	Tidal Models		Land Use Past Industrial	Engine House. Start: 1930 End: 1950		Protected View (Indicative Zone)	View 7 RICHMOND PARK TOWARDS ST PAULS CATHEDRAL		SFRA Zone 3a High Probability	Flood Zone 3		Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Zone 2 Medium Probability			Village	Barnes Village		Village Character Area	Barnes Waterside and the London Wetlands Centre - Character Area 3 Barnes Village Planning Guidance Page 25 CHARAREA04/03/01		Ward	Barnes Ward	
Area Benefiting Flood Defence - Environment Agency	Areas Benefiting from Defences																																			
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018																																			
Floodzone 2	Tidal Models																																			
Floodzone 3	Tidal Models																																			
Land Use Past Industrial	Engine House. Start: 1930 End: 1950																																			
Protected View (Indicative Zone)	View 7 RICHMOND PARK TOWARDS ST PAULS CATHEDRAL																																			
SFRA Zone 3a High Probability	Flood Zone 3																																			
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Zone 2 Medium Probability																																				
Village	Barnes Village																																			
Village Character Area	Barnes Waterside and the London Wetlands Centre - Character Area 3 Barnes Village Planning Guidance Page 25 CHARAREA04/03/01																																			
Ward	Barnes Ward																																			
Planning history	Ref	Proposal	Decision																																	
	20/2380/PS192	Rear dormer roof extension and 2No. front skylights.	refused permission																																	
	20/1178/HOT	<p>Demolition of existing conservatory. Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. Rear dormer roof extension and 2 no. rooflights on front roof slope. Replacement boundary walls.</p> <p>Reasons for refusal:</p> <p>The proposals by reason of their excessive height, depth, bulk and design would create an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development which will appear out of keeping with the scale and character of the property and</p>	refused permission																																	

		<p>harmful to the character and appearance of the locality/host terrace. Additionally, there would be extensive material harm to the amenity of the occupiers at the neighbouring properties at 11 and 13 Heidegger Crescent due to a loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of policies LP1 & LP8 of the Local Plan 2018 and following supplementary planning documents/guidance; House Extensions and External Alterations & Barnes Village Plan.</p>	
<p>Policies</p>	<p>The proposal has been considered having regard to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Local Plan, in particular:</p> <p>Publication Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality • LP 5 Views and Vistas • LP 8 Residential Amenity and Living Conditions • LP 21 Flood Risk <p>Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House Extensions and External Alterations • Barnes Village Plan 		
<p>Material representations</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>7 public objections have been received, from 6 neighbouring properties. These comments are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will severely undermine the character and design integrity of Heidegger Crescent and the locality, as well as seriously impact residential amenities and living conditions. • We strongly believe that the proposed two-storey rear extension, particularly the overly protuberant first-storey addition, would significantly harm the character of the Crescent and give rise to an incongruous, unsympathetic form of development that is not integral to the house or the locality. We feel that by reason of its height, bulk and prominence, it would dominate rather than enhance and harmonise with the rear elevation of the house and appear out of context to the terrace/locality. It would also provide prominent views from the path in the public wildlife corridor to the rear, especially when combined with the 2m-high brick boundary wall. • The plans are incompatible with the area and are not based on a sound understanding of the site and its context. • Heidegger Crescent is characterised by boundary treatments consisting of unobtrusive wooden fences approx. 1.8m high, which contribute to the visual enjoyment of the area, especially the public wildlife corridor at the rear. This proposal seeks to replace the wooden fences with a 2m-high solid brick wall with higher parapets, which wraps itself around the entire garden. It is felt that this would constitute an insensitive, uncharacteristic feature in the area and by reason of its scale and massing would be obtrusive and domineering. • The brick wall is wrongly shown on the plans, as it proposes to be built on land belonging to Nos 11 and 13. • All garage doors within Heidegger Crescent have an identical 3 x 4 panel formation, with a 4-panel fascia above. A few have been modified from an up-and-over operation to double doors that swing outwards, but in all cases they retain the same 3 x 4 panel look when shut. This application seeks to change the garage door to a 3 x 3 panel formation with a 3-panel fascia above and a single door. This detracts from, rather than enhances, the Crescent's distinctive and clear identity 		

	<p>and that a proliferation of garage doors of differing styles would be detrimental to the design integrity of the Crescent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed two-storey rear extension combined with the 2m-high brick boundary wall by reason of their size, height, mass and proximity will have a seriously detrimental effect on residential amenities due to their extremely overbearing visual impact and the feeling of enclosure they will create, when viewed from the neighbouring garden, ground-floor extension, through the ground-floor extension skylight and when looking out from windows on the first and second floors. • Overlooking/loss of privacy • Sunlight and daylight/overshadowing • The rear extension will make this house different from all other houses. Apart from aesthetics, it will have impact on privacy. • The boundary wall also is uniform in this development - any change will make it incongruous. • Trees • The proposed extension and re-modelling of No. 12 will severely change the character of the crescent by becoming an eyesore - visible from all neighbouring backyards and conservatories - and distort the harmony of the Barnes Waterside design concept and the resident community. • The 1st floor extended outwards proposal is an aberration to the standards of the Crescent. It would result in an overbearing rear elevation of about 6.8m from ground level to the apex of the pitched roof. It would permanently damage the design, style and integrity of the Crescent and its standards of living and likely trigger a sequence of aberrations in the Crescent. • Objection to the 2m-high solid brick wall with higher parapets to replace the wooden fences. Whilst there is a case in the Crescent, we feel it should represent an exception as it is clearly overbearing and detrimental to the character of the area. • The proposed extension will clash with the symmetry of windows and balconies at the rear of the Crescent. • The gardens in the Crescent are separated by 1.8m high wooden fences which, with the vegetation, creates an open and natural vista at the rear of the Crescent. A 2 metre high brick wall will box in the garden and damage the rear appearance of the Crescent. <p>These comments have been addressed under the 'Professional Comments' section below.</p>
Amendments	None.
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 • Protected View • Neighbour Amenity • Flood Risk <p>It is also necessary to consider whether previous reasons for refusal have been addressed.</p> <p>Design/Visual Amenity <i>Policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the site and its context when considering the design including layout, siting and access and the compatibility of the works to the neighbouring uses.</i></p> <p><i>The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that the overall shape, size and position of rear extensions should not dominate the existing</i></p>

house or its neighbours. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition.

Rear Extension

It is proposed to demolish the existing conservatory extension to the rear of the property to allow for the provision of a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension. The proposal would run the full width of the existing house at ground level; with a depth of 3m from the original rear elevation and a height of 3m. The extension is single-storey in height to the sides of the dwelling and two-storeys in height to the centre of the dwelling. The first floor element has a width of 3.2m, depth of 3m, with a pitched roof; ~6.8m maximum height and ~6m to the eaves.

The ground-floor element of the scheme has been reduced in depth from that submitted under 20/1178/HOT. The council consider the reduced ground-floor addition acceptable as it has been re-designed in line with existing extensions along the host terrace row.

Notwithstanding the above, the council continue to raise an objection to the first-floor element of the scheme.

Given the unique uniformity of the host terrace row the council will resist first-floor rear extensions along this terrace. The proposed first-floor extension is considered to be overly prominent and bulky in order to be subservient to the original dwellinghouse. It would over-dominate the rear elevation and disproportionately increase the scale of the property. Furthermore, the pitched roof fails to relate to the form and appearance of the host property and the addition would completely destroy the uniform arrangement of windows and balconies at the rear of the Crescent. It cannot be considered that the original appearance/shape of the dwelling was the reference point when designing the proposals. The scheme is found to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the dwelling itself, neighbouring dwellings and view from the public wildlife corridor to the rear of the application site.

Relationship with Locality

The proposal site forms part of a uniform terrace, which retains strong symmetry between the dwellings. Whilst it is accepted the majority of dwellings within this terrace do benefit from rear extensions these are all at ground level only. None of the dwellings within this terrace are subject to two-storey extensions. The application site adjoins a public wildlife corridor to the rear, this proposal would form prominent views from this path. Due to these reasons the proposal is considered to be incongruous with the surrounding area. The development would erode part of the character of the crescent and give rise to an incongruous form of development which would not be in keeping and too far removed from its original setting, hence not integral to the locality. Overall, the design of this extension is not considered to have taken the original form of the house or locality into consideration and there is no balance to its integrity.

The combination of the proposed works due to their excessive height and bulk would appear out of scale and character with the existing property and would appear dominant and incongruous to the area, contrary to policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 and relevant supplementary planning documents/guidance.

Boundary Wall

It is proposed to replace the existing ~1.8m high, wooden fence, boundary treatment with a new 2m high brick wall. The proposed brick wall boundary treatment will wrap around the sides and rear curtilage of the property.

Whilst the replacement of wooden materials for brickwork will add bulk, it is acknowledged that high level walls/fences of differing material/appearance currently feature in this terrace row. As such, the replacement wall is found tolerable in this instance.

The scheme has been amended from the previously refused scheme under 20/1178/HOT to ensure the height of the new boundary treatment will be consistent with other boundary treatments within the locality. The reduced height of 2m is considered acceptable.

Replacement Garage Door

The front elevation of the properties along the host Crescent remain largely unaltered, with the exception of some minor alterations. Having undertaken a full planning history search, none of the properties along the terrace have gained consent to alter the garage, therefore the symmetry of the garages along the row has largely been retained.

All garage doors within Heidegger Crescent have an identical design, comprising a 4 x 4 panel design, with a 4-panel fascia above. It is therefore noted that submitted existing front elevation has not illustrated the existing garage design correctly thereby it is unclear whether the proposed garage door design accurately reflect the intended design.

Based on the submitted proposed drawing, this application seeks to change the garage door to a 3 x 3 panel design (incorporating a single door), with a 3-panel fascia above. The creation of a door opening on the garage door will create an outline of a single leaf door on the garage door therefore will appear incongruous in particular along a uniform terrace row. As such, the council will seek to retain this uniformity and this element of the proposal will detract from the distinctive and clear pattern to the garage doors, detrimental to the design integrity of the host terrace, contrary to policy LP1 of the Local Plan, 2018 and relevant SPD/SPG's.

Protected View

Policy LP5 of the local plan states 'The council will protect the quality of the views, vistas, gaps and the skyline, all of which contribute significantly to the character, distinctiveness and quality of the local and wider area'

Due to the siting and proposed height of the scheme being lower than that of the surrounding built form, it is considered this proposal will have a neutral impact on the Richmond Park towards St Pauls Cathedral protected view.

Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP8 states that development must protect the amenity and living conditions of existing, adjoining and neighbouring occupants. Design must allow for good daylight standards, avoid overlooking or noise disturbance, avoid visual intrusion, overbearing impacts or harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the uses of buildings and gardens. Harm may arise from various impacts such as noise, air pollution, odours or vibration.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that where houses are terraced and/or have small gardens, overlooking should be minimised by restricting the side of the window and setting windows back from the eaves.

Rear Extension

Single-Storey Element

The proposed extension would project no more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining neighbouring properties (11 & 13 Heidegger Crescent), this is considered an acceptable projection which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. It is considered that the proposed single-storey element of the rear extension will not result in any unreasonable overbearing, loss of light, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to these properties.

Two-Storey Element

The two-storey rear extension is set in from the shared boundary line with the neighbouring dwellings (~1.55m - 1.65m), because of this set in it is found the scheme will not result in any unreasonable loss of light, or appear visually obtrusive/overbearing on the neighbouring dwellings.

In terms of privacy and overlooking, it is found that the fenestration would not lead to any new onerous viewing angles further to what can already be achieved from the existing first floor fenestration on the property.

Boundary Wall

The proposed replacement boundary treatment has been reduced in height to a maximum of 2m, this is considered an acceptable height for a boundary treatment as to not appear visually obtrusive or to create a sense of enclosure to the neighbouring dwellings.

	<p>Replacement Garage Door The replacement garage door will have a neutral impact in terms of neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>The property would remain solely in residential use as a result of the proposal. An undue increase in noise or pollution would not occur as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is found this scheme complies with the aims and objectives of LP8 of the Local Plan, 2018 and relevant SPD/SPG's.</p> <p>Flood Risk <i>Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan states 'All developments should avoid or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.</i></p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been provided as part of this application to comply with the requirements of LP21, which confirms the floor levels within the proposed development to be set no lower than existing levels AND, flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate.</p> <p>Other Matters <u>Land Ownership</u> The brick wall will be erected on shared boundaries between No's.11 & 13, This is considered a civil issue and is to be addressed under the Party Wall Act 1996. Had this scheme have been found acceptable in all other matters an informative would have been included.</p> <p><u>Trees</u> Public objections have been raised regarding impact on surrounding trees. The proposal site is not situated within a conservation area and there are no trees subject to a 'Tree Preservation Order' in close proximity to the development site. Therefore, the trees within the area do not have statutory protection. The council find that there are no trees of amenity value near the proposed rear extension, thus the scheme is found to be in accordance with policy LP16.</p> <p>Conclusion The proposed first floor extension by reason of its siting, height and design and the replacement garage door by reason of its unacceptable siting and design will create an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development which will appear out of keeping with the scale and character of the property and are found harmful to the character, symmetry and appearance of the host terrace row. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of, in particular, policy LP1 of the Local Plan, 2018 and following supplementary planning documents/guidance; House Extensions and External Alterations & Barnes Village Plan.</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): KM

Dated: 23.10.2020

I agree the recommendation:

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

Dated: ...WWC.....23/10/2020.....

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

U0046488	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42
U0046489	Decision Drawing Numbers