

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE 25th MAY 2017

APPLICATION NO. **DATE VALID**

17/P0842 24/02/2017

Address/Site: 1 Hadleigh Close Merton Park SW20 9AW

Ward: Merton Park

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension

Drawing No's: PA-02 Rev B & PA-03 Rev C

Contact Officer: Joyce Ffrench (020 8545 3045)

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 - 10
- External consultations - No
- Density - N/A
- Additional employment - N/A.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is presented to the Planning Committee due to the scope and number of objections which have been received from neighbouring owner/occupiers.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site is a semi-detached property constructed as part of a re-development of 20 houses to the rear of properties in Aylward Road following the demolition of Nos. 18 & 20 Aylward Road.
- 2.2 The property has no permitted development rights (under Classes A,B,C & E) as these were removed as a condition of planning permission reference 94/P0291.

- 2.3 The property has been extended with a side/rear conservatory extension and the garage has been converted into a habitable room.
- 2.4 The property has off-street parking and there is a side gate giving access to the rear garden. To the side of the property is a gated track allowing vehicle access to garages associated with Nos. 2 – 16 Aylward Road
- 2.5 The original rear elevation of properties in Aylward Road are approximately 30m. from the flank wall of the site and have outbuildings at the ends of their gardens
- 2.6 The house is not in a conservation area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks permission to erect a two-storey side extension with a hipped roof to a width of 3.4m.
- 3.2 The extension would incorporate a hipped roof and there would be a minimum gap of 0.6m. to the side boundary
- 3.3. Windows to the flank wall to the first floor will be high level and clear glazed.
- 3.4 A small tree located close to the conservatory, which is to be demolished, would be removed.
- 3.5 Plans have been amended during the course of the application to reduce the bulk of the scheme, changing the roof design from a gable ended roof to a hipped roof, and the size of flank wall windows which takes into account officer concerns regarding potential impact on privacy and the visual impact of the proposals.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 94/P0291 - demolition of 18 & 20 Aylward Road and the existing bungalow to form an access road and the erection of 20 two storey dwellings. Approved at Planning Committee. The permission includes the following condition:-

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting this Order) no buildings, extensions or alterations permitted by Classes A,B,C and E of Part 1 of the 2nd Schedule of the 1988 Order shall be carried out without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority. Reason for condition: To prevent an overdevelopment, having regard to the restricted nature of the site.

- 4.2 96/P0097 - erection of single storey side conservatory extension – approved

4.3 09/P2540 - conversion of existing garage into a bedroom with en-suite bathroom with new window to front elevation – approved

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.

5.3 On the matter of Design, and pertinent to the assessment of the application the NPPF encourages local planning authorities:

- To optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development;
- To ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.
- Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.
- To ensure developments respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.
- Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

5.4 Merton Site and Policies Plan (2014).

DM D2: Design considerations in all developments.

DM D3: Alterations and extensions to existing buildings.

DM.O2: Nature conservation, trees hedges and landscape features.

5.5 Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011).

CS 14: Design

5.6 Merton Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (2001).

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The application has been advertised with a site notice and neighbour letters. Nine letters of objection were received following consultation of the original plans submitted following pre-application advice. Following the receipt of amended plans a re-consult was undertaken– 7 letters of objection were received as a result, raising the following concerns:-

- Loss of privacy due to size of flank windows
- Design is un-neighbourly, overwhelming and does not complement the style and symmetry of the development in Hadleigh Close
- Out of proportion with the adjoining property
- Changes the use of the dwelling out of proportion to its original concept
- Sense of encroachment to properties in Aylward Road
- Possibility of trespass on to the private road during construction
- Loss of light
- Side access is too narrow

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning considerations are impact on neighbour amenity, design and impact on trees.

7.2 Impact on neighbours

The flank wall of the extension is a minimum of 0.6m to the boundary of the application site and approx. 30m from the rear elevations of 14 & 16 Aylward Road - i.e. the properties which directly back on to the flank wall of the application site. All the properties in Aylward Road which are served by the vehicle access track (2 – 16 Aylward Road) have outbuildings at the bottom of their gardens which partially obscures the application site from view.

7.3 The visual impact of the proposed extension has been reduced by changing from a gable ended roof to a hipped roof. The applicant has also reduced the flank windows to high level windows only and, with a distance of 30m. separating the properties, there is no loss of privacy.

7.4 Officers consider that as a result of the changes to the design and in combination with the distance separating the existing dwellings in Aylward Road from the flank of the proposed extension the proposals would not result in a sense of encroachment, loss of light or privacy to properties in Aylward Road.

7.5 Design

The side extension would retain a gap of 0.6m to the site boundary. While SPG guidance recommends a gap of a metre to a site boundary where two storey side extensions are proposed the guidance is primarily aimed at properties which are part of rows of terraces or pair of semi-detached properties where regular spacing can contribute to the character of an area and where infilling can result in a harmful terracing effect. Officers consider that the application of the guidance would be inappropriate in this case due to its position in Hadleigh Close and its relationship to existing dwellings in Aylward Road.

Officers would note that any short term intrusion on the private road to the rear of properties in Aylward Road in the course of building works is a private matter and outside planning control.

7.6 The design of the extension, which now incorporates a hipped roof, is considered acceptable and not out of keeping with the original design. The width of 3.4m. is more than half the width of the original property however it is not considered that this additional width has any detrimental impact on the appearance of the property or the estate of which it is a part.

7.7 The proposals would provides additional accommodation while maintaining the size of the front and rear gardens Officers consider that, following amendment, stating the design of the extension would complement the style of Hadleigh Close.

7.7 The design of the extension is not considered to be out of proportion to the original building and is considered appropriate to its surroundings thereby fulfilling the objectives of policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF (2011) and policies DM D2 & DM D3 of the Sites and Policies Plan (2014).

7.8. Trees

There is a small tree on site which will have to be removed to accommodate the proposed extension. This tree is not protected by a TPO and has no significant wider amenity value that might be judged as contributing to the quality of the public realm. Having regard to the objectives of policy DM.O2, which seeks to resist proposals for development that would remove trees or significant amenity value, officers raise no objection to the loss of the tree and it would be unreasonable to withhold permission on the basis of its loss.

8. **CONCLUSION**

8.1 The amended scheme, which is a minimum of 0.6m. from the boundary of the plot and incorporates a hipped roof and high level windows to the flank wall, is

considered acceptable in planning terms and does not impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1 A.1 Time limits
2. A.7 The development hereby permitted shall be erected in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 B2 – matching materials.
- 4 C2 - no permitted development – no windows and other openings in flank wall facing Aylward Road.

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load