

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
21 May 2015

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	15/P0177	12/01/2015
Address/Site:	Ground floor flat 85 Amity Grove, Raynes Park, London, SW20 0LQ.	
Ward:	Raynes Park	
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear and side infill extension.	
Drawing No's:	A499-002-001 B04, A499-002-002 B04, A499-002-003 B04, A499-002-005 B04, A499-002-006 B04]	
Contact Officer:	Ike Dimano (020 8545 3300)	

Recommendation: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

- " S106: N/A
- " Is a screening opinion required: No
- " Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- " Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted - No
- " Press notice - No
- " Site notice - Yes
- " Design Review Panel consulted - No
- " Number of neighbours consulted - 5
- " External consultations – No
- " Density - N/A

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is brought before the Planning Applications Committee as a result of the nature and content of representations.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is currently occupied by a two storey semi-detached building which is divided into two self-contained units. The subject accommodation is laid out as a one bedroom flat. The adjoining property, 83, is also arranged as two

flats. 87 Amity Grove is currently occupied as a single family dwellinghouse. The property is on the west side of Amity Grove. There is an alleyway which runs adjacent to the bottoms of rear gardens serving nos. 79 - 85 Amity Grove and along the side of no. 84 Durham Road.

- 2.3 The Merton Sites and Policies Plan, accords the site no specific land use designation, the building is not listed and the site does not fall within a conservation area or a flood risk area. There are trees in the rear garden area of the site, however these are not protected.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The applicant seeks planning permission to erect a single storey side and rear extension measuring a maximum width of 4.45m, maximum height of 3.3m (with a shallow-pitched roof, adjoining no. 87) and a maximum length of 7.2m (3.5m where it adjoins no. 87).
- 3.2 Five high level windows would be sited in the side elevation of the rear addition. A total of three new windows and one set of French doors are proposed in the side and rear elevations of the extension.
- 3.3 The application plans indicate that the extension is to be used as a "living room, kitchen and bathroom". Additional storage would be provided along the length of the passage.
- 3.4 The proposed section drawings show that the extension would have a maximum height of 3.3m, when measured from the rear garden level of the adjacent house at no. 87.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

- 4.1 MER796/84 – Conversion into 2 flats.
- 4.2 05/P1737 – Top flat - Erection of rear mansard roof extension. Planning permission granted September 2005.

5. RELEVANT POLICIES.

National Planning Framework [March 2012]

- 5.1 The National Planning Framework was published on the 27 March 2012. This document is put forward as a key part of central government reforms '...to make the planning system less complex and more accessible, and to promote sustainable growth'.
- 5.2 The document reiterates the plan led system stating that development which accords with an up to date plan should be approved and proposed development

that conflicts should be refused. The framework states that the primary objective of development management should be to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent development. To enable each local authority to proactively fulfil their planning role, and to actively promote sustainable development, local planning authorities need to approach development management decisions positively and look for solutions rather than problems so that applications can be approved wherever it is practical to do so. The framework attaches significant weight to the benefits of economic and housing growth, the need to influence development proposals to achieve quality outcomes; and enable the delivery of sustainable development proposals.

5.3 Site and Policies Plan 2014

The relevant policies in the Merton Sites and Policies plan include:
DM.D2 (Design Considerations in all Developments)
DM.D3 (Alterations and extensions to buildings).

5.4 Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011)

The relevant policies in the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy include:
CS14 (Design)

5.5 London Plan 2011

The relevant policies in the London Plan include:
7.6(Architecture)

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The submitted planning application was publicised by means of a site notice and individual consultation letters sent to 5 neighbouring properties. In response, 3 comments and 2 letters of objection have been received raising concerns with regard to the following:-

- The proposed extension would result in loss of day and sunlight to the adjacent occupiers at no 87 Amity Grove
- The proposal would be visually intrusive to adjacent occupiers. at no 87 Amity Grove
- The resulting extension would be out of character in with the building and surrounding area.
- The proposed extension would result in an over development of the site.
- Concerns over the accuracy of drawings.
- The extension would result in undue dominance in the locality.
- The flank wall of the extension would encroach on boundary with no 87 Amity Grove

- 6.2 Following receipt of revised plan, which comprised a reduced length (down from 4.5m to 3.5m), width (down from 4.6m to 4.45m) and height (down from 3.8m to 3.3m), one further letter of objection was received, which reiterated earlier concerns.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main issues to consider are impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers and design and impact on the character of the building. The impact on existing trees will also be assessed.

Neighbour amenity

- 7.2 Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the amenity of nearby residential properties.

- 7.3 The extension would be set away from the boundary with adjacent property at no.83a by 0.7m and would sit on the boundary and be adjacent to that of no. 87. The plans show that it would have a projection of approximately 3.5m beyond the existing rear wall of no.87. Given the single storey nature of the extension, its separation distance from one boundary, projection beyond no.87 and the orientation of the site, it is not considered that there would be any severe adverse impact on the amenities of the adjacent occupiers in terms of visual intrusion, and loss of daylight as a result of the extensions. Whilst the proposal fails the Merton daylight/sunlight test, this can throw up anomalies, even in instances where an extension would otherwise have been permitted development.

- 7.4 Concerns have been raised regarding the extension and these are listed above, however it is considered that the amended drawings adequately address the issues of concern. The applicant has offered to finish the north facing elevation in white render and members may consider this a suitable finish so as to further reflect light and could be made a condition of any permission.

Character of the Building and Surrounding Area.

- 7.5 Policy DM D2 seeks to ensure a high quality of design in all development, and states that development will respect the form, scale, bulk and proportions of the original building and respect space between buildings where it contributes to the character of the area. It continues to state that appropriate materials should be used which would complement and enhance the character of the wider setting. Policy DM.D3 expects extensions to respect and complement the design and detailing of the original building and its form scale bulk and proportions.

- 7.6 The extension is single storey and its rear element would span 4.45m across the width of the host building. Given its single storey nature, location on the site and overall size when compared to that of the host building, it is not considered that the proposed extension would be detrimental to the character of the building and

the design and appearance of the enlarged building would be acceptable and in accordance with Policy DM D2 and DM.D3.

7.7 Impact on Trees

Whilst there are trees on the site, there are no Protection Orders registered against any of them and the site is not within a Conservation Area. The Tree Officer has been consulted and has raised no concerns, suggesting that tree protection measure be enforced by way of a condition in order to protect existing trees from harm/damage.

8 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The proposed extension as amended is considered to be appropriately designed and sited, and would neither detract from the visual amenity of the area nor would it result in a harmful impact on amenities of adjoining occupiers. Concerns raised in respect of neighbour amenity have been noted but are considered to have been mitigated by modifications to the plans, reducing the scale of the proposed extension.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant permission subject to the following conditions

1. A.1 Commencement of development within 3 years
2. A.7 Approved Plans
3. B.2 Matching Materials (other than the flank wall facing 87 to be rendered and painted white)
4. D.11 Construction Times
5. F.5D Tree Protection

This page is intentionally left blank