

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
29th April 2021

UPRN	APPLICATION NO. 20/P1046	Item No: DATE VALID 16.07.2020
Address/Site	57 Coombe Lane Raynes Park SW20 0BD	
(Ward)	Raynes Park	
Proposal:	ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF DORMER EXTENSIONS AND GARDEN ANNEX.	
Drawing Nos;	Site location plan and drawings; 1312-PL02-201 Rev A, 1312-PL02-202 Rev A, 1312-PL02-203 Rev B, 1312- PL02-204 Rev B, 1312-PL02-205 Rev A & 1312-PL02- 206 Rev C	

Contact Officer: Leigh Harrington (020 8545 3836)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to relevant conditions

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

- Heads of agreement: No
- 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: 5
- Press notice – No
- Site notice – Yes
- External consultations: Nil
- Archaeological Priority Zone – No
- Flood risk zone - No
- Controlled Parking Zone – No
- Number of jobs created: N/A
- Density N/A

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Committee due to the level of public interest and the nature of objections.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached single family dwelling located on the south side of Coombe Lane in Raynes Park. The property has a single storey rear extension which touches a conjoined garage accessed via a shared drive and a further utility room to the rear. The rear of the site backs onto the rear gardens of houses in Camberley Avenue. The site is not in a conservation area.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

The application is for ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, HIP TO GABLE AND REAR ROOF DORMER EXTENSIONS AND GARDEN ANNEX and follows a refused scheme for a longer full width first floor rear extension, LBM Ref 19/P2398.

- 3.1 As with the previous scheme, on the ground floor the proposals involve the erection of a further 2m of single storey rear extension to the existing 4m depth to create a larger full width extension featuring an open plan kitchen and dining room with sliding doors out to a shallow patio in the back garden. The extension would have a flat roof with central skylight and for this proposal it would now be finished in render to the sides and rear elevation with zinc being confined to the flat roof of the extension.
- 3.2 This extension would extend over part of the shared access to the garage. The extension would also cut into the existing garage which would be remodelled as a flat roofed utility room with the existing utility room being demolished.
- 3.3 A garden outbuilding would be erected at the end of the garden to provide an office space to the front and storage to the rear. The 3m high flat roofed structure would also be finished in a mix of render and zinc. The outbuilding would have side access and a door flanked by glazed panels in the elevation facing the house.
- 3.4 The main difference between the refused proposals and the application before members is the new first floor level. In the previous refusal this part of the proposal was to have projected 2.25m from the rear of the house and full width with a flat roof to provide a larger bedroom with ensuite. The initial plans for the current proposals only varied the earlier scheme in terms of the replacement of a flat roof with a pitched one. Following further discussions the design has again been amended such that externally measured the extension would be 2m deep and would now be set 2m away from the boundary with the adjoining neighbour.

3.5 At roof level the proposals involve the creation of a hip to gable and rear roof dormer extension. The roof works would be of a standard design and appearance for this type of extension. The full width dormer would be finished in hanging roof tiles with rear facing fenestration and the gable element of the roof would accommodate three roof lights to the front roof slope. There would be no window in the flank elevation and the interior would accommodate two bedrooms, a bathroom and a storage space.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

19/P2398 Planning application Refused for the erection of a part single part two storey rear extension and a garden annex and alterations to existing attached outbuilding.

Reason The proposed part single part two storey rear extension, by reason of their design, materials, position, bulk and massing, represent an unneighbourly form of development that would be unduly prominent, visually dominant and intrusive, detracting from the appearance, scale and proportions of the host dwelling, failing to enhance and relate positively and appropriately to the siting, scale, proportions, height and massing of surrounding buildings and wider public realm. The proposals would be contrary to London Plan 2016 policies 7.4 & 7.6, policy CS.14 of the Merton LDF Core Planning Strategy (2011) and policies DM D1, DM D2 and DM D3 of the Merton sites and Policies Plan (2014).

19/P2401 LDC issued in respect of a proposed hip to gable and rear roof dormer extension and the inclusion of three roof lights in the front roof slope.

15/P1022 Planning permission granted for retention of a single storey structure (attached to rear garage)

12/P1559 Certificate of Lawful development issued for a proposed outbuilding.

12/P3365 Lawful development certificate issued in respect of a proposed hip to gable and rear roof dormer extension with two front roof lights.

5. CONSULTATION

Site notice was posted outside the property and letters sent to neighbours. The two side neighbours objected to both consultations and the one to the rear only to one of them following the changes the matter was reconsulted upon. Objections raised concerns relating to;

- The rear outbuilding should be 2m from the boundary.
- The hammerhead area is not entirely the neighbours and is a shared access. There has been no agreement between the two

houses (59 and 57) about use of this shared land for a permanent structure, i.e. the proposed width extension of their ground floor.

- We do appreciate that there have been some amendments to the initial plans, in particular that the width of the proposed first floor extension has been reduced and a pitch rather than flat roof is now proposed, but remain concerned at the potential impact in terms of scale and size (i.e., 'bulk and massing'). We believe, therefore, that the grounds for the previous refusal continue to apply.
- There has been a reduction in the width (but not the length) of the proposed extension to the first floor. This does nothing to improve our sight of the side elevation compared with previous applications.
- Claim for a precedent at 79 is misleading as there is no first floor extension there.
- The sloping roof of the proposed new first floor extension is an untoward 0.87 m higher than the original roof line and this also emphasises its unsuitability. If there is to be a slope (as opposed to a flat roof) it should start no higher than the top of the original wall line and slope down from there.
- To suggest that the single storey rear extension will "*only project 2 m from existing rear building line*" is meant to be misleading
- Harmful impact on appearance of the front garage conversions and structural integrity caused by the mis-match in design.
- The existing laurel tree needs to be protected.
- Incomplete application forms
- Should the application be approved, we would request that:
 1. The applicant is informed that the Party Wall Act 1996 is applicable and that we would expect to be informed in writing in advance of any works commencing so that we could appoint our own Party Wall Surveyor, to be paid for by the applicants;
 2. The redevelopment should prohibit access to the flat roof on the ground floor in order to protect our privacy;
 3. The applicant ensures there is no negative impact on the common foul sewer that runs at the back of our properties and which the currently planned rearward extension would be built upon.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

London Plan 2021.

D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach.

D4 Delivering good design.

Merton Core Strategy 2011.

CS 14 Design

Merton Adopted Sites and Policies Plan 2014.
DM D2 Design considerations
DM D3 Alterations and extensions to buildings

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The planning considerations in this case relate to the impact of the scale and design of the part single part two storey rear extension, hip to gable and rear roof dormer extensions and garden annex and alterations to existing attached outbuilding on the appearance of the house, the wider setting and neighbour amenity.

7.1 Scale and bulk

It is considered that any proposal should comply with SPP policy DM D3 and Core Strategy Policy CS 14 and should be well designed and sympathetic to both the bulk and proportions of the original building whilst complementing the character and appearance of the wider setting and respecting the space between buildings where it contributes to that character, whilst policy DM D2 requires the use of appropriate materials. Additionally London Plan policy D3 requires that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

7.2 The ground floor proposals would extend the depth of the existing 4m extension by more than 2m to take the overall external depth to around 6.3m. The flat roof design would cross over to the altered garage so that it also had a new flat roof and this would abut the tiled pitched roof of the neighbour's part of the garage building. The ground floor extension could be built over the shared access to the garages subject to neighbour agreement. The ground floor works would now be finished in a white painted render to better reflect the existing building and to be less visually intrusive than the previously proposed zinc sections. The works would be 3.26m high above the deck and about 3.4m above ground level.

7.3 Concerns were raised about the impact of having a flat roof abutting the pitched roof element of the garage given the symmetry of the existing garage building. Whilst the garage building is set back from the pavement it is readily visible from the street, however the proposed height of the garage is such that the flat roof would only sit marginally lower than the existing shared ridge line which is considered to mitigate the impact of the divergent roof pitches such that it would not warrant a refusal of the application.

7.4 The proposals include works at first floor level and now in response to officer and neighbour concerns the extension would no longer be full width and would be set in 2m from the adjoining property and have a reduced depth of 2m. The originally proposed flat roof being replaced

by a pitched roof and the zinc accents have been removed. These changes reduce the bulk and visual impact of the proposals.

7.5 The hip to gable and rear roof dormer constitute development and have been included as part of the application for the sake of completeness. Officers note however that they would be within permitted development tolerances and have already been issued a Lawful Development Certificate.

7.6 The outbuilding is considered to be sufficiently set away from the house and neighbouring properties so as not to be harmful to either the house appearance or character.

7.7 With extensions at ground, first and roof levels it may reasonably be considered that the proposals represent a significant increase in the scale, bulk and massing of the original building. However the works to the house are located predominantly to the rear and the house itself is a large property set within a large plot. The materials, whilst modern, are now more reflective of the original house and, on balance, it is considered that the proposals accord with relevant policies sufficiently so as not to warrant a refusal of the application.

7.8 Neighbour amenity

SPP policy DM D2 requires proposals not to have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbours through loss of light, privacy and visual intrusion. London Plan Policy D3 requires proposals not to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and that people feel comfortable with their surroundings.

7.9 Objections were received from neighbouring residents concerned that a loss of light would occur as a result of the height of the ground floor extension and the protrusion at first floor level. However at ground floor level the adjoining neighbour has their own extension and the proposed extension would only be around 2m longer than that. At first floor level the closest windows are frosted bathroom windows. It is considered that the impact on light to habitable rooms would be limited such as to not warrant a refusal on the grounds of loss of light. The works have also been positioned such as not to encroach within the “45 degree angle of view” of neighbouring windows which is considered to mitigate the impact of any visual intrusion. The works to the house are therefore not considered harmful to the visual amenities of neighbours.

7.10 Objections were raised concerning the impact of the outbuilding on the amenity of the neighbour to the rear of the site. The outbuilding will be 3m high and at its closest point to the boundary would be 1.38m from the rear fence. At this point it is to be largely set behind mature trees and where it is not screened by the trees it is to be 2.13m from the boundary. It is considered that this would be sufficient space from that rear boundary not to cause any significant loss of light or overshadowing to the neighbouring garden.

In view of these factors the proposals are not considered to be materially harmful to neighbour amenity.

7.11 Other matters

Objections were raised concerning building on the shared garage access. Part of the ground floor works would be outside the curtilage of the property and take place on the shared access. This land is typically marked in a different colour by the Land Registry as whilst part of the applicants land there is a right of access over it for the neighbouring property and vice versa. This right of access is to allow ease of access for both properties to the garages. The grant of planning permission would not override the need for the applicant to reach an agreement with the neighbours with a right of access over that land to allow any construction to take place.

8. SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS.

8.1 The proposal does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly there is no requirement for an EIA submission.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1 Officers have negotiated reductions in the size of extensions and secured an amended design which is considered acceptable. Compared to the previously refused application the applicant has removed some of the zinc panelling from the first floor extension and reduced the width and the depth of the first floor rear extension in order to reduce the impact on neighbour amenity and to make the works less visually intrusive. Additionally the flat roof would now be a tiled roof. These amendments are considered to have overcome previous reasons for refusal.

9.2 Extensions at ground, first and roof levels the proposals represent a significant increase in the scale, bulk and massing of the original building. However the works are located predominantly to the rear of the house, the outbuilding being at the far end of the garden and the house itself is a large property set within a large plot and the proposals have been designed to limit the impact on neighbour amenity. It is therefore considered that the proposals have overcome previous reasons for refusal and on balance they do not warrant a refusal of permission.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

1. A1 commencement of works
2. A7 Built to plans Site location plan and drawings 1312-PL02-201 Rev A, 1312-PL02-202 Rev A, 1312-PL02-203 Rev B, 1312-PL02-204 Rev B, 1312-PL02-205 Rev A & 1312-PL02-206 Rev C,
3. B2 Matching materials
4. C8 No use of flat roof
5. D 11 Hours of construction

Shared access informative.

The granting of planning permission for this development does not confer or imply to confer a right to build on land in shared or communal ownership. The applicant is advised to secure any necessary consents over and above planning permission and approval under the Building Regulations in order to build on the shared access way leading to the rear of the site.