

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE  
11 AUGUST 2016

:

UPRN	APPLICATION NO.	DATE VALID
	16/P2084	19/05/2016

Address/Site: 3 Reclose Avenue Morden SM4 5RD

Ward: St Helier

Proposal: Erection of a first floor rear extension

Drawing Nos: N/05, N/06, N/07, site and site location plan

Contact Officer: Joyce Ffrench (020 8545 3045)

---

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

---

## CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Head of agreement: N/A
- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted: No
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 2
- Press notice: No
- Site notice: Yes
- External consultations: No
- Density: N/A
- Number of jobs created: None

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is brought before the Planning Applications Committee due to it being 'called in' by Councillor Pearce due to concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site and impact on neighbour amenity

## 2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse in a cul-de-sac formed of 4 properties. An outbuilding was erected under permitted development circa 2011. The plot is of an unusual shape due to the fact that it is at the end of a cul-de-sac. The main house is currently being extended with a two storey side extension and single storey rear extensions

2.2 The site is not in a conservation area.

2.3 At the time of the site visit construction was underway for the approved extensions. A 3-metre high fence had been erected between the rear extension and the outbuilding on the boundary of No. 4

### 3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

3.1 The erection of a first storey part width rear extension to a depth of 3m.

### 4. PLANNING HISTORY

14/P2257 – prior approval in relation to the erection of a single storey rear extension with the following dimensions: extends beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by 6 m.; the maximum height of the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse will be 3m.; the height of the eaves of the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse will be 2.8m. – prior approval granted

14/P1052 – erection of a part two-storey, single storey side and rear infill extension – approved

08/P2377 – erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension – refused

02/P0516 – change of use of ground floor to mixed use residential dwellinghouse and homework club - approved

### 5 CONSULTATION

5.1 The application was advertised by means of neighbour notification letters and a site notice.

5.2 2 letters of objection have been received. Below is a summary of the concerns raised.

- 'Boxed in' by 3m. high fence
- Outbuildings not illustrated on plans
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Built extension may not meet building regulations
- Enforcement notice has not been complied with (officer comment: there are no enforcement notices relevant to this property)
- Over development

## 6. POLICY CONTEXT

Sites and Policies Plan 2014

DM D2:- Design considerations in all developments

DM D3:- Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

Core Planning Strategy 2011

CS 14 Design

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (2001)

## 7 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning issues relate to design, potential overdevelopment of the site and neighbour amenity.

7.2. The extension has been designed with materials to match existing (annotated on plans) and has a hipped roof to blend in with the original roof form

### 7.3 **Design and appearance**

Policy DM D3 states that development should respect the proportions of the original building and complement the character and appearance of the wider setting.

The extension is at first floor level and to the rear and will not be visible from the street and does not impact on the amount of amenity space available for a family plot.

While it is accepted that the property has already been the subject of significant extensions, in recent years the Government has set in place additional rights for homeowners to extend their homes and the occupier has utilised these rights to build the rear extension

### 7.4 **Neighbour Amenity**

There are no windows to the flank (north) wall of the extension which faces No. 4 therefore it is not considered that this proposal would result in a loss of privacy to the occupier of No. 4

A light test to the nearest rear bedroom window at No. 4 did not record any loss of light to that window as a result of the proposed part width extension which is inset 3.5m. away from the boundary with No. 4.

The fence erected between the properties has no planning consent and does not form part of the proposals. The applicant has stated that this was erected to reduce the impact of noise and dust at the request of the occupiers of No. 4 and that it will be removed once building work is complete. An informative will be added to any approval in this regard.

#### 7.5 To address the objections:-

Objections not related to the application proposal:

- 1) The applicant states that the 3m. high fence has been erected at the request of the occupiers of No. 4 to reduce the nuisance caused by construction noise and dust. A confirmation has been received from the applicant that this fence will be removed once construction is complete. (photographs demonstrate this has been done)
- 2) A plan incorporating all outbuildings has been submitted by the applicant although this is not necessary for the assessing of the proposal
- 3) Building Regulations – there is a Building Control notice reference IN16/05146 on LBM records indicating that the building works are being overseen by a private company not LBM; this is not relevant to the assessment of the planning application
- 4) Enforcement Notice not complied with – there is no Enforcement Notice issued relevant to this address

Objections related to the proposal:-

- 1) loss of light, loss of privacy and over development are dealt with above.

#### 8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- 8.1 A sustainability score would not be applicable due to the small-scale nature of this development.
- 8.2 In terms of an Environmental Impact Assessment the proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development and as a result there are no requirements in terms of an EIA submission.

#### 9. CONCLUSION

The site has had several significant extensions, all with planning approval. The plot is of an unusual shape being at the end of the cul-de-sac and it is concluded that the proposal does not have any significant impact on the occupiers of No. 4 therefore it would be unreasonable to refuse this application.

## RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1 A.1 Commencement of development.
- 2 A.7 Approved Plans
- 3 B.2 Matching materials
- 4 C.2 No permitted development (windows and doors)

Informative:- The 3m. high boundary fence which has been constructed between the application site and No. 4 should be removed once construction work is complete to avoid Enforcement action

---

To view Plans, drawings and documents relating to this application please follow [the link](#)

Please note that this link, and some of the related plans may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank