

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
5th September 2013

Item No: 05

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	13/P0610	20/03/2013
Address/Site:	46 Deburgh Road, Colliers Wood, SW19 1DU	
(Ward)	Abbey	
Proposal:	Erection of two-storey side extension, rear dormer roof and hip to gable roof extensions in connection with conversion of existing four-bedroom house into 2 houses (1 x 3 & 1 x 2 beds).	
Drawing Nos:	1100, 1200(A), 1201(A), 1202(B), 1203(B), 1300 (dated 30/06/2013), 1301(B), 1302(B) & One Unnumbered Drawing Showing Proposed Site Plan received 22/08/2013.	
Contact Officer:	David Gardener (0208 545 3115)	

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Obligation.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: Education
- 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: 32
- External consultations: None
- Number of jobs created: N/A

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications

Committee due to the requirement for a Section 106 agreement with regards to the above heads of terms.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two-storey end of terrace four bedroom house, which is located on the north side of Deburgh Road, between the junctions with Norman Road and Hanover Road.
- 2.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with an eclectic mix of building styles. The application site is not located within a conservation area.
- 2.2 The site has a PTAL rating of 3 and is located in Controlled Parking Zone. The existing house features an attached garage with off-street parking for approx. two cars.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The original application has been amended from a proposal to extend the existing 4-bed property and convert into 2x 3-bed houses to a proposal to extend and convert into a 3-bed and a 2-bed house. The extensions would comprise a two storey side extension and a rear dormer. The two storey side extension would be 3.2m wide, designed to match the main house with the same eaves and ridge height, extending the main roof across, with the same front and rear building line..
- 3.2 The 3-bed house would have a gross internal floor area (GIA) of 102.4sq.m and a 53 sq m rear garden and the 2-bed house would have a GIA of 81.1sq.m and a 45sq.m rear garden. The application also proposes significant improvements to the overall appearance of the existing building with the walls being rendered and the windows replaced.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 No relevant planning history.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 The relevant policies in the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) are:

HS.1 (Housing Layout and Amenity), BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise), BE.22 (Design of New Development), BE.23 (Alterations and New Extensions), BE.24 (Roof Extensions and Dormer Windows), F.2 (Planning Obligations), RN3 (Vehicular Access)

- 5.2 The relevant policies in the Adopted Core Strategy (July 2011) are:

CS.8 (Housing Choice), CS.14 (Design), CS.15 (Climate Change), CS.20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)

- 5.3 The relevant policies in the London Plan (July 2011) are: 3.3 (Increasing Housing Supply), 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Developments), 3.8 (Housing Choice), 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction). The mayor's Housing SPG Nov 2012 is also relevant.
- 5.4 The following Merton Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is also relevant:
Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The application has been publicised by means of a site notice and letters to neighbouring occupiers. No letters of representation have been received.
- 6.2 Transport Planning – No objections

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main issues to be considered are the design of the proposed roof extensions, the standard of accommodation to be provided, and any implications with regards to neighbour amenity and traffic and parking.

7.1 Standard of Accommodation

- 7.11 The London Plan is part of Merton's development plan. It was published in July 2011 and Policy 3.5 sets out a minimum gross internal area standard for new homes. It supersedes the standards in Merton's New Residential Development SPG 1999.
- 7.12 In addition, adopted policy CS.14 of the Core Strategy and HS.1 of the UDP encourages well designed housing in the borough by ensuring that all residential development complies with the most appropriate minimum space standards and provides functional internal spaces that are fit for purpose. New residential development should safeguard the amenities of occupiers by providing appropriate levels of sunlight & daylight and privacy for occupiers of adjacent properties and for future occupiers of proposed dwellings. The living conditions of existing and future residents should not be diminished by increased noise or disturbance.
- 7.13 The proposed three-bedroom house would have a GIA of 102.4sq.m which meets the standard of 102 sq m for a 3 bed 5 person house set out in Policy 3.5 of the London Plan. It would also have a 53 square metre garden, meeting the 50 sq m requirements set out in the justification for UDP Policy HS1.
- 7.14 The two bedroom house has a GIA of 81.1 sqm, which is only marginally below the London Plan standard of 83 sq m for a 2bed 4 person house. The

layout is high quality with well proportioned rooms, good outlook, light and circulation space and a good sized family bathroom and downstairs w.c. It is not therefore considered that the minimal shortfall in floorspace would warrant refusal. It has a private rear garden area of 45 sq m. The garden is regularly shaped with a gated side access as well as direct access from the house and although there would be a shortfall of 5 sqm it serves a 2-bedroom house which would only accommodate a small family. The small shortfall is not considered to warrant refusal in this instance.

7.3 Visual Amenity

- 7.31 Policy BE.23 of the UDP requires extensions to respect or complement the design and detailing as well as be sympathetic to the form, scale, bulk and proportions of the original building. Policy BE.24 states that roof extensions in existing buildings will be permitted provided that the proposal would not create a gabled roof form in an area where hipped roofs dominate and the dormers will be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches.
- 7.32 The two-storey side extension is designed to match the existing house in terms of its design and detailing so that when the building is split, the two houses would appear almost identical when viewed from the street. The existing house features a double hipped roof and the proposal would result in both houses having a gabled roof. It is considered that this is acceptable given a number of houses along the road, including the terrace feature a gabled roof.
- 7.33 The proposed dormer roof extension would be set back 80cm from the main façade of the three bedroom house and would be set in 80cm from the flank/party walls, which means it would not be overly dominate the roof slope. In addition, the existing building has a negative impact on the appearance of the terrace and is in need of updating, particularly in terms of its materials. The existing poor quality facing brickwork would be replaced by render and new double glazed windows installed. This would greatly improve the appearance of the building within the street-scene.
- 7.34 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing building, the terrace or the wider area and as such accords with policies BE.23 and BE.24 of the UDP and is acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

7.4 Residential Amenity

- 7.41 Policy BE.15 of the UDP requires extensions to protect amenities from visual intrusion and ensure good levels of privacy for occupiers of adjoining properties.
- 7.42 Given the building would not be extended at the rear it is considered that the proposal would not impact on the amenity of occupiers of the adjoining terrace, No.38. A significant gap would also remain between the side

extension and No.50 due to the location of an off-street parking area between the properties. Nevertheless, the side extension would not impact on No.50 as this property does not feature any windows in its flank wall, and its rear elevation extends further back than the proposal.

- 7.43 A pair of semi-detached bungalows (Nos.48a & 48b) are located behind the rear boundary of the site. It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the levels of privacy enjoyed by occupiers of these properties or be visually intrusive or overbearing. This is because Nos. 48a and 48b are orientated at a right angle to No.46, which means only the flank wall of No.48a would directly face the proposed side extension and dormer. It should also be noted that only a kitchen and small secondary living room window are located in this elevation and they do not directly face the application property.
- 7.44 The main garden area to Nos. 48a and 48b is located approx. 8m from the proposal. After discussions with Council officers, the dormer on the two bedroom house was removed given its very close proximity and the fact that it would directly face the rear garden of Nos.48a and 48b. As the remaining dormer would face the flank wall of No.48a it is considered that this element will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of occupiers of these properties. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity and as such accords with policy BE.15 of the UDP.

7.5 Parking and Traffic Issues

- 7.51 The Councils Transport Planning raises no objections to the principle of the development, which proposes no off-street parking for either house. It is not thought that the proposal would lead to the creation of significant traffic impacts that will adversely affect the smooth operation of the existing local highway network.
- 7.52 Although the site is located in a Controlled Parking Zone, it is not considered that S106 'Permit Free' agreement is necessary in this instance as the removal of the existing off-street parking would mean that at least one on-street parking space could be provided in front of the house. A condition will be attached requiring that the additional house is not occupied until the redundant crossover has been removed and the kerb raised.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

- 8.1 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of EIA submission.

9. LOCAL FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The proposed development would result in a net gain in gross floor space and as such will be liable to pay the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards Crossrail.

10. SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT

10.1 Affordable Housing

- 10.11 In terms of affordable housing, Policy CS.8 of the Core Strategy requires developments of 1 – 9 units to make an off-site financial contribution for provision of affordable housing in the borough. The affordable housing contribution is calculated based on a formula using the median open market valuation of the completed development based on three independent valuations.

- 10.12 The applicant has stated that a S106 for affordable housing would make the development unviable. An independent appraisal, at the developer's expense has therefore been carried out. The appraisal shows that the scheme as proposed would be unable to deliver both the affordable housing contribution and a reasonable target profit margin. In this instance, the affordable housing contribution will need to be waived to offer the developer a profit margin of 8%. This is considerably lower than the 15-20% profit margin normally accepted in an appraisal and it would not be reasonable to anticipate that the scheme would be progressed at any lower profit margin.

10.2 Education

- 10.21 Adopted UDP Policy C.13 states that where new housing development will lead to a need for improved or additional educational provision, such provision, or financial contributions towards the facility, will be sought. The Supplementary Planning Document provides a formula for these obligations based on the likely number of children, supply and demand figures for each ward and the cost of education provision. There is an identified shortfall in funding of secondary and primary education provision in the borough, and in the light of the type of accommodation proposed and the location of the application site, an education contribution would be required in this instance. In this case the proposal would result in one additional unit of two-bedrooms or more, which would be capable of accommodating a child likely to require educational provision. After applying this formula a figure of £3,710 would be sought as a S106 planning obligation.

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1 It is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of visual and residential amenity, and would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation to future occupiers, whilst not having a detrimental impact on parking/highway function, and as such is in accordance with Adopted UDP and Core Strategy policies. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to a S.106 Agreement and conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

Subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:

1. Financial contribution for the provision of improved educational facilities (£3,710);
2. The developer agreeing to meet the Council's costs of preparing, drafting and monitoring the Section 106 Agreement.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. A.1 (Commencement of development (full application))
2. B.3 (External Materials as Specified)
3. B.4 (Details of Site/Surface Treatment)
4. B.5 (Details of Walls/Fences)
5. C.1 (No Permitted Development (Extensions))
6. D.11 (Construction Times)
7. H.3 (Redundant Crossovers)
8. J.1 (Lifetime Homes)
9. INF.27 (Community Infrastructure Levy)
10. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF, The London Borough of Merton (LBM) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. LBM works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:
 - Offering a pre-application advice and duty desk service.
 - Where possible, suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome.
 - As appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

In this instance:

- The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

This page is intentionally left blank