

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 10th December 2015

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>Item No:</u> <u>DATE VALID</u>
	15/P3587	16/09/2015
<b>Address/Site:</b>	80 Melbourne Road, SW19 3BA	
<b>Ward:</b>	Abbey	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of roof extensions.	
<b>Drawing No.'s:</b>	10063A01001, 10063A03001, 10063A04001, 10063A05001 and 'Planning Application Support Document' dated September 2015	
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Jock Farrow (020 8545 3114)	

---

### RECOMMENDATION

**Refuse planning permission.**

---

### CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 6
- External consultations: 0
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination at the request of Councillor Katy Neep.

#### **2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site is located at 80 Melbourne Road, SW19 which is on the corner of Melbourne Road and Brisbane Avenue. The site is irregular in shape with an oblique angled southern boundary; the site is occupied by a two storey (with loft level) end-terrace dwelling. Due to the corner location, the

host dwelling has two street frontages and a highly visible roofscape. The dwelling is attached to a terrace row which fronts Brisbane Avenue; the host dwelling continues the architectural features of this terrace by incorporating a two storey bay window with gable. However, the property is unique in that while it repeats the bay windows and gables of the Brisbane Avenue terrace row, the main architectural features of the dwelling address Melbourne Road, which include the entrance and shallow bay windows. Due to the irregular shaped site, the resulting dwelling has a stepped façade and an undulating, multi-pitch roof.

- 2.2 The host dwelling is surrounded by two storey (with loft level) residential development with a large commercial premises opposite the dwelling, across Melbourne Road. The site is not located within a conservation area.

### **3. CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for roof extensions, including a hip to gable end extension to the part of the roof fronting Brisbane Avenue and an additional half storey along the length of the dwelling facing Melbourne Road. Two roof lights are also proposed to the roof slope fronting Brisbane Avenue.
- 3.2 The proposed extension would have a flat roof and vertical walls; the resulting form would be largely square and would be contemporary in appearance, making use of extensive glazing.

### **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 There is no relevant planning history recorded at the application site.

### **5. CONSULTATION**

#### 5.1 Public:

6 neighbouring properties were consulted directly by way of letters and a site notice was posted outside of the site – No representations were received.

#### 5.2 Councillors:

Councillor Katy Neep – Supports proposals. Councillor Neep’s representation is summarised as follows:

- Grounds for refusal are based on design which is subjective;
- Proposal would not intrude on other properties;
- Design is sympathetic and high quality, thus enhancing, and remaining in keeping with, the area;
- Due to the subjective nature of the application and given there have been no objections, requests the application be decided at committee, in the interest of democracy.

### **6. POLICY CONTEXT**

#### 6.1 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2012):

Part 7. Requiring Good Design

#### 6.2 London Plan Consolidated 2015:

7.4 Local character

7.6 Architecture

- 6.3 Merton Sites and Policies Plan July 2014 policies:  
DM D2 Design considerations in all developments  
DMD3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- 6.4 Merton Core Strategy 2011 policy:  
CS 14 Design
- 6.5 Supplementary Planning Guidance:  
Merton Council Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The planning considerations for an extension to an existing building relate to the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building along with the surrounding area and the impact upon neighbouring amenity.

### Character and Appearance

- 7.2 London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3 require well designed proposals that will respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of the original building and their surroundings. SPP policy DMD3 further seeks for roof extensions to use compatible materials, to be of a size and design that respect the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context, do not dominate the existing roof profile and are sited away from prominent roof pitches unless they are a specific feature of the area.
- 7.3 The roofscape is a key characteristic of any building, it is important that any roofscape assimilates effectively with the host building as well as the surrounding area to achieve a coherent design, thus protecting the visual amenity of the area.
- 7.4 The host dwelling has a unique, undulating, multi-pitch roof which is attributable to the unique shape of the site and the fact the site is located upon a corner plot. Due to the site's prominence (being located upon a corner plot), the roofscape is highly visible from, and contributes significantly to, the streetscene.
- 7.5 The proposal which seeks to extend the Brisbane Avenue roofslope from hip to gable end, infill the Melbourne Road elements of the roof and essentially add a half floor to the dwelling would completely transform and dominate the roofscape. The proposed development would result in conflicting styles, having a contemporary appearance at the effective second floor level and a traditional appearance at ground and first floor levels. The resulting roof profile would fail to respect the character, appearance or proportions of the host dwelling, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area and the streetscene.
- 7.6 The proposed roof extension by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, design and resulting roof profile would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of

development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the area as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to the relevant planning policies listed above.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.7 SPP policy DMD2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion or noise.
- 7.8 The applicant has undertaken a sunlight and daylight assessment which has concluded that there would be no undue loss of light to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed roof extension. The sunlight and daylight assessment provided follows good practice and it is considered that that the conclusion is accurate.
- 7.9 The use of the dwelling would remain as residential and separate legislation (Building Regulations) would ensure appropriate insulation to noise; therefore, it is not considered the proposal would result in an undue impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring properties nor would it result in undue noise intrusion.
- 7.10 All proposed windows would either be directed to the rear or to the south. The window to the rear would be directed toward the flank elevation of No. 78 Melbourne Road, which does not have flank windows. The windows to the south would overlook the public domain, in Melbourne Road. Therefore, it is not considered that any proposed windows would result in an undue loss of privacy for neighbouring properties. However, the proposal does involve an enclosed, flat section of roof which is directly accessible from full length glazed doors. While the applicant has advised that the flat section of roof is for maintenance purposes only, the configuration is reminiscent of a roof terrace. If the enclosed section of roof were to be used as a roof terrace, direct overlooking would be provided to the rear gardens of the surrounding residential properties. Additionally, outlook would likely be provided to the rear windows of the Brisbane Avenue terrace row. Had this application been recommended for approval, it is considered that restricted access to the roof could have been imposed by way of condition. Overlooking that may arise could be addressed by way of condition, and it may be unreasonable to cite overlooking as a reason for refusal in the event that permission is refused.
- 7.11 Given the bulk of the extension fronts Melbourne Road, it is not considered the proposal would result in undue visual intrusion for neighbouring properties.
- 7.12 It is considered that with the use of suitable conditions, the proposal would not result in undue adverse effects on neighbouring amenity and would achieve compliance with SPP policy DMD2.

**8. CONCLUSION**

The proposed roof extension by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, design and resulting roof profile would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the area as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3.

It is therefore recommended to refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

The proposed roof extension by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, design and resulting roof profile would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would detract from the appearance of the original building and be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the visual amenity and character of the area as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy policy CS14 and Merton SPP policies DMD2 and DMD3.

This page is intentionally left blank