

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
9 FEBRUARY 2017**

<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
16/P4696	01/12/2016
Address/Site:	29 Carlingford Gardens, Mitcham, CR4 2AT
Ward:	Graveney
Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Drawing No.'s:	400 (Rev: B), 401 (Rev: B) and Site Location Plan
Contact Officer:	Jock Farrow (0208 545 3114)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

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: No
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 3
- External consultations: 0
- Controlled Parking Zone: No

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the nature and number of objections received and at the request of Councillor Geraldine Stanford.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two storey (with loft level) end terrace dwelling which is located on the eastern side of Carlingford Gardens and at the end of Manship Road. The host dwelling is of a traditional design incorporating a two storey bay window to the front and a hipped end roof. The site is triangular in shape, with the southern boundary being oblique. The terrace row, of which the host dwelling is a part, fronts Figges Marsh, a park which is designated open space. The site is considered to be prominent, given the flank elevation is visible along the approach from Manship Road and the dwelling, along with the terrace row in its entirety, is highly visible from

Figges Marsh. The site is not located within a conservation area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL AND BACKGROUND

- 3.1 This application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension.
- 3.2 The proposed two storey side extension would be setback from the front façade and the rear elevation by 1m and 0.6m respectively; the footprint would be regular, albeit it would step in toward the rear to correspond to the constraints of the site; the front and rear roof slopes would match the gradient of the host dwelling and would incorporate matching hipped ends, given the stepped footprint of the extension the roof profile would result in a cascading roof form; the extension would be set down from the main ridge by 0.65m; the extension would maintain a minimum setback from the side boundary of 0.4m.
- 3.3 The proposed extension would have the following dimensions: 4.3m wide to the front, 2.8m wide to the rear, 5.4m deep, 5.3m high to the eaves and 7.6m maximum height.
- 3.4 Facing materials would match those of the existing dwelling.
- 3.5 This application is a resubmission of applications 15/P3489 and 16/P3826, both of which were refused and are identified in section 4 of this report.
- 3.6 Application 15/P3489 proposed an integrated side extension which would match the height of the host dwelling and would sit flush with the front façade; the application was refused by reason of its bulk, form, scale, appearance and its impact upon the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The application was then dismissed at appeal. The proposed plans and elevations of application 15/P3489 are included as Appendix 1 to this report whereas the appeal decision is included as Appendix 2.
- 3.7 Application 16/P3826 was considered to have addressed the reasons for refusal cited under application 15/P3489 by reducing the dimensions and by proposing a subordinate side extension; however, the application introduced a hip to gable extension which would be adjoined by the two storey side extension with its hipped end. As such, this application was refused by reason of its form, appearance and its contrived roof form. The proposed plans and elevations of this application are included as Appendix 3 to this report.
- 3.8 It is considered that the reasons for refusal cited in the decision notices of applications 15/P3489 and 16/P3826 have been addressed under this current application; the merits of this application are discussed in detail in section 7 of this report.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

14/P2477 - ERECTION OF A NEW 2 BED END OF TERRACE DWELLING HOUSE – Refused. Reasons for refusal:

The proposed dwellinghouse, by reason of its size, design, siting and site coverage, would constitute an incongruous form of development

which would fail to respect the character and appearance of the adjoining terrace and wider townscape and would result in a cramped form of development that would lead to the loss of existing open space to the detriment of the visual amenities of the Carlingford Gardens and Manship Road streetscene. contrary to policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2011), policy CS.14 of the Merton Core Strategy (2011), and policies DM.D1 and DM.D2 of the Merton Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

The proposed dwellinghouse, by reason of its cramped internal layout and inadequate outdoor amenity space would result in an unsatisfactory environment to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers contrary to policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2011), policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy and policy DM.D2 of the Merton Core Strategy (2011).

The proposed development would fail to contribute to meeting affordable housing targets and in the absence of a legal undertaking securing a financial contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing off-site would be contrary to policy CS.8 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011).

15/P3494: LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED ERECTION OF A HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF EXTENSION WITH INSTALLATION OF 2 x ROOFLIGHTS TO FRONT ROOF SLOPE – Granted.

15/P3489: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION – Refused. Reasons for refusal: **The proposed side extension by virtue of its bulk, form, scale, design and the resulting loss of openness 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, SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3 and the Merton Council - SPG; Residential Extensions, Alterations & Conversions (NOVEMBER 2001). Appeal dismissed.**

15/P3494: APPLICATION FOR A LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE IN RESPECT OF THE PROPOSED ERECTION OF A HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF EXTENSION WITH INSTALLATION OF 2 x ROOFLIGHTS TO FRONT ROOF SLOPE – Granted.

16/P3826: TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, ROOF EXTENSIONS FROM HIP TO GABLE END AND TO THE REAR AND TWO ROOFLIGHTS TO THE FRONT ROOF SLOPE – Refused. Reason for refusal: **The proposed development, by reason of its design, form and appearance, would result in an incongruous form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. 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.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of post sent to neighbouring properties – 4 objections were received, the summary of objections is as follows:
- Exacerbate parking pressure
 - Compromise highway safety
 - Compromise safety of cyclists and pedestrians
 - Concerns regarding storage of materials
 - Increased congestion during construction
 - Loss of openness
 - Obtrusive development
- 5.2 Councillor Geraldine Stanford – requests the application be determined at Planning Applications Committee due to the number and nature of the objections including concerns regarding the impact of the construction phase on the highway network and how this may be mitigated.
- 5.3 Transport Planner: No objection. Advised that the construction phase would not generate a significant impact upon the highway network and that extensions of the scale proposed are common place in this residential area.

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 (2001).

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 are of the highest architectural quality and incorporate a design that is appropriate to its context, so that development relates positively to the appearance, scale, bulk, form, proportions, materials and character of the original building and their surroundings, thus enhancing the character of the wider area.
- 7.3 It is considered that the proportions and the footprint of the proposed two storey side extension are acceptable in the way that they relate to the host dwelling and the constraints of the site. The setback from the front façade along with the set down from the roof ridge are considered to be acceptable to achieve a subordinate appearance. In conjunction with the subservience of the extension, it is considered that the matching roof form results in a sympathetic addition which would respect the host dwelling along with the surrounding context. In addition, it is recommended to include a condition requiring external materials of the development to match those of the host dwelling.
- 7.4 It is noted that in the case of two storey side extensions, a 1m set back from the side boundary would normally be expected to retain a sense of openness, to avoid the potential for a future terracing effect, and where properties abut the pavement, to avoid an overbearing impact upon the streetscene. However, given the sites' positioning, fronting Figges Marsh and being at the end of Manship Road, along with the staggered nature of the flank wall, it is considered that the proposed setback from the side boundary would be acceptable in this instance.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.5 SPP policy DM D2 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 and noise.
- 7.6 Given the scale and positioning of the proposed extension along with the outlook provided from the proposed windows, it is not considered that the proposal would unduly impact upon neighbouring amenity.

Other matters

- 7.7 LDF policy CS.20 provides an overarching framework for regulating the highways impacts of developments including not to adversely affect safety the convenience of local residents and on-street parking. These impacts may be both long term and short term. Public objections highlight the narrow nature of the cul-de-sac and raise concerns regarding the impact of the construction phase upon highway safety and parking provisions. Transport Planning officers do not consider the proposals would have a significant or long term impact on the highway. However, the road layout and its narrowness are acknowledged and some impact would arise. Officers consider it would be prudent to include a condition which would require details of vehicle parking and (un)loading to be submitted to, and approved by, Merton Council in

accordance with policies 6.3 and 6.14 of the London Plan 2015, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014 in order to ensure the continued and safe functioning of the highway and in the interests of neighbour amenity.

8. CONCLUSION

The scale, form, design, positioning and materials of the proposed extensions are not considered to have an undue detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the area, the host building or on neighbouring amenity. Therefore, the proposal complies with the principles of policies DMD2 and DMD3 of the Adopted SPP 2014, CS14 of the LBM Core Strategy 2011 and 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015. It is not considered that there are any other material considerations that would warrant refusal of this application.

It is therefore recommended to grant permission subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION. Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B2 Matching Materials
4. H09 Construction Vehicles: The development shall not commence until details of the provision to accommodate all site workers', visitors' and construction vehicles and loading /unloading arrangements during the construction process have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

[Click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load