

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
13 November 2014

<u>UPRN</u>	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	14/P1863	15/08/2014

Address: 6 Cherry Close Morden SM4 4HA

Ward Cannon Hill

Proposal: Demolition of the existing single storey garage and the erection of a part single, part double storey extension to the side and rear and a detached garage

Drawing Nos: chec-6/2 Revision A & chec-6/9 received 17/06/2014; chec-6/3 & chec-6/7 Revision A received 15/08/2014; site location plan

Contact Officer: Joyce Ffrench (020 8545 3045)

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to 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
 - Press notice: No
 - Site notice: Yes
 - Design Review Panel consulted: No
 - Number of neighbours consulted: 6
 - External consultations: No
 - Number of jobs created: N/A
-

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is being brought before the Planning Applications Committee for determination because it has been called in by Councillor David Dean

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two-storey end of terrace residential property. The side [south west] boundary of the site adjoins the rear gardens of the two storey residential properties at 15 – 27 Cherrywood Lane.
- 2.2 The application property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac that consists of 14 residential properties [no's 1-12, 14, 15] that are arranged in three terraces. A single storey block of 4 residential garages is located in Cherry

Close adjacent to the front boundary of the application site with access to the application property across the forecourt of these garages,

- 2.3 The front of the application site is mainly laid to hardstanding to accommodate off-street parking. There is an existing detached garage to the side of the application property on the boundary of Nos 23 & 25 Cherrywood Lane
- 2.4 The site is not located in a conservation area and not in a controlled parking zone.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The applicant seeks planning permission to erect a part single, part double storey extension to the side and rear of the application property and a new detached single storey garage.
- 3.2 The extension will extend along the side elevation of the application property from the front elevation and 3 metres beyond the existing rear elevation of the property. The ground floor of the extension will extend to the side boundary of the property with the extension set back by one metre from the side boundary at first floor level. The extension providing a new study and family room at ground floor level and two new en suite bedrooms at first floor level will allow the applicant's parents to be accommodated at the property.
- 3.3 The existing garage to the side of the property will be demolished to allow the two storey extension to be constructed. It is proposed to construct a new detached single storey garage on land to the front of the property and adjacent to the existing block of 4 garages that are located adjacent to the application site.
- 3.4 This proposal is the re-submission of a planning application that was approved in 2005 but was never implemented.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 05/P1420 - erection of a two storey side extension and erection of a free-standing single storey garage - approved
- 4.2 04/P2492 - Erection of a two storey side extension to form a separate dwelling house, also erection of a double garage within the front garden area. Planning permission was refused for the following reasons:

“The proposed side extension would, by reason of its design, siting, bulk and massing appear as an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling, harmful to the appearance of the terrace of dwellings, and the visual amenities of the Cherry Close streetscene, unduly dominant and detrimental to visual amenities of the occupiers of Cherry Wood Lane and would be contrary to policies BE.22 and BE.23 of the Unitary Development Plan (October 2003) and the Council's adopted

Supplementary Planning Guidance "Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions" (November 2001)"

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 The following policies from the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014):

DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
DM D3 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
DM T3 Car Parking and servicing standards

5.2 Core Planning Strategy 2011

CS.14 Design
CS.20 Parking Service and Delivery

5.3 The following Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is also relevant: Residential Extensions, Alterations and Conversions (November 2001).

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The application has been advertised through a standard 21 day site notice procedure and individual letters to neighbouring occupiers.

6.2 In response to this consultation, three letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are as follows:

- The proposal is town cramming
- loss of privacy and overlooking from the top rooms of the development
- overbearing and dominating – impacting on the enjoyment of property
- loss of view
- loss of value of property
- noise and smell impact from bathrooms on neighbours using their garden
- would create a claustrophobic environment
- loss of sunlight
- loss of outlook
- building works/removal of tree will result in damage to property

6.3 Transport Planning: No objection

6.4 Highways Team: No objection

6.5 Tree and Landscape Officer: It is confirmed that the Willow tree that is due to be removed is not in good condition and is not worthy of protection.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main planning considerations relate to the design of the proposed extension and its potential impact on residential amenity.

Design

- 7.2 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that extensions to buildings should respect and complement the design and detailing of the existing building. Policy DM D2 also states that extensions should respect the form, scale, bulk, and proportions of the original building.
- 7.3 The application property is currently of a design and appearance that is typical of the surrounding area including a first floor window bays and gable roof to the front elevation and a sloping roof above a ground floor that protrudes forward of the first floor and incorporates a porch to the main entrance. The main pitched roof of the property is of a hip end design.
- 7.4 The proposed extension has been designed to reflect the form and appearance of the existing application property. The first floor of the extension has been set back from the ground floor to the front and side elevations to reflect the design of the front elevation of the existing property. With a first floor window bay to the front elevation, the location, design and proportions of the windows also reflect those in the existing property. A planning condition is recommended to ensure that the proposed facing materials match those on the existing property.
- 7.5 The existing property has a hip end roof design and the design of the proposed two storey extension has been designed to replicate this design with provision of a hip end roof. The design of the two storey extension uses the integrated approach [rather than set back] in terms of the relationship with the existing terrace and this is considered acceptable in this location.
- 7.6 The proposed detached garage is of a size that has been designed to match the existing adjoining garage block. The scale, appearance and design of the garage that has a flat roof is considered acceptable in this location.
- 7.7 Whilst this location at the end of a cul-de-sac means that the application site is not in a prominent location it is considered that the proposal would be of a size and design that respects the character and proportions of the original building and surrounding context. The proposal would therefore accord with policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

Residential Amenity

- 7.8 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) state that proposals should ensure for provision of appropriate levels of

sunlight and daylight and privacy, whilst protecting existing development from visual intrusion.

- 7.9 A distance of 25 metres separates the front elevation of the existing garage on the application site from the front elevation of the property at 5 Cherry Close. With this separation distance across the adjoining single storey garage block it is not considered that the extension will result in a loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight or cause visual intrusion to the occupants of this property.
- 7.10 Whilst the two storey rear section of the proposed extension will extend 3 metres past the rear elevation of the application property, the extension will be separated from the boundary with 7 Cherry Close by a distance of 6 metres. In this context and with no proposed windows looking towards this neighbouring property it is not considered that the extension will harm the amenities of the occupiers of this adjacent property in terms of visual amenity, loss of privacy, daylight and sunlight.
- 7.11 The side boundary of the application site and the side elevation of the existing single storey garage on the application site are separated from the closest residential property in Cherrywood Lane by a distance of 18.5 metres.
- 7.12 With the location of the proposed single storey new garage and the relationship with adjoining properties it is not considered that the garage or its use will impact upon residential amenity.
- 7.13 The side elevation of the extension has two bathroom windows at first floor level and a planning condition is recommended to ensure that these windows are fitted with obscured glass to ensure that they do not result in a loss of privacy to adjoining residents. Whilst the properties in Cherrywood Lane are located to the south west the proposed extension will be seen against the backdrop of the existing property. In this context with the separation distance and use of planning conditions it is not considered that the proposed extension will result in loss of privacy, sunlight or daylight and will not cause visual intrusion to the occupants of properties in Cherrywood Lane.

Trees

- 7.14 A willow tree is currently located to the rear of the existing detached garage on the application site and close to the side boundary of the property. This tree is to be removed as part of the application. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has confirmed that the tree is not in good condition and is not worthy of protection.

Neighbour Objections

- 7.15 Whilst the majority of issues that have been raised as a result of public consultation have been addressed in the above report the following responses are also provided.

Town cramming

- 7.16 A single storey garage currently occupies the land to the side of the application property and the current proposal will replace the garage with a two storey extension. It is common within the borough for two storey properties to extend to the side boundary and it is not considered that this type of extension will harm visual amenities.

Loss of a view and impact on property values

- 7.17 The loss of a view and any impact on the value of land or property are not valid planning considerations

Potential noise and smells from the proposed bathrooms

- 7.18 The application includes two new en suite bathrooms. The installation of a bathroom does not require planning permission and it is considered that the normal domestic use of these new bathrooms will not cause nuisance to adjoin occupiers or harm the enjoyment of neighbouring gardens.

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. CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed side extension would be of a size and design that respects the form, scale, bulk, and proportions of the original building, and would complement the Cherry Close streetscene. The proposed garage is of acceptable design and would not impact on the appearance of the streetscene or on neighbour amenity
- 9.2 The proposal would not be visually intrusive, overbearing or result in an unacceptable level of daylight/sunlight loss or privacy for adjoining properties. The proposal would therefore accord with policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development for full application)
2. B.2 (Matching Materials)
3. C.2 (No permitted development - windows & doors)
4. C.3 (Obscure glazing – fixed windows) – to the flank windows of the first floor.
5. NOTE TO APPLICANT: The applicant is advised that in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, The

London Borough of Merton takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The London Borough of Merton 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 and as appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application. In this instance the application was acceptable as submitted, no further assistance was required and 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