DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - Date: 20th January 2010

Report of the Executive Head of Planning and Transportation.

Ref: C2009/62072/3FR	WARD: ST HELIER	Time Taken: 7 weeks, 1 days

Site: 15 LINDORES ROAD Carshalton Surrey SM5 1BQ

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension to provide replacement bathroom
Applicant: London Borough of Sutton
Agent: Mr Andy Moore

Reason for Report to Committee: The Council owns the site.

Summary of why application proposals are acceptable

- The single storey extension is not considered to detract from the appearance of the dwelling or the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposal does not adversely impact on the amenities of adjoining residents.

1.0 **BACKGROUND**

1.1 **Site:**

1.2 The application site comprises a two storey mid-terrace house faced in red brick with a brown tiled pitched roof, located on the northern side of Lindores Road. The house has an existing single storey rear extension and its replacement is the subject of this application.

1.3 **Surroundings:**

1.4 The site is located in the St Helier Estate, which is characterised by inter-war two storey terraced housing, mostly faced in either red brick or brown brick, although some have been faced in painted render.

1.5 **Site specific UDP designation:**

1.6 The site is not located within a site specific UDP designation.

1.7 **Relevant Planning History:**

- None

2.0 **APPLICATION PROPOSALS**

2.1 **Background to Proposals:**

2.2 Timber box bathrooms were installed during the 1960s' to terraced and semi-detached houses built during the 1930s' in order to provide a separate bathroom. Those existing pod units installed in the 1960s' are now far beyond their economic life. Typical problems relate to moisture ingress such as decayed timber elements, leaking roofs and structural distortions. Between 2004 and 2007 some 200 of these units were replaced with a larger, 4m depth pre-fabricated pod incorporating a bathroom and utility room. However, this type of pod had disadvantages as it took 3 or 4 days to install, as it involves assembly of pre-fabricated parts within the rear gardens once the existing pod had been removed. Also, at the time because the pods were permitted development and built in pre-cast 'pebbledash' style panels they did not harmonise with the existing brick built houses.

2.3 The current application, submitted by Sutton Housing Partnerships as agents, forms part of the Council's Decent Homes Programme, which affects 750 dwellings across St Helier and aims to replace all remaining box bathrooms over the next 5 years. The benefit of the new box bathrooms are that they improve access for disabled users, having wider doors, provide more room for users (including a utility room), are faced in external materials that better match the existing house and can be installed more quickly as they are craned into position fully assembled. The removal of the existing pod and the provision of the replacement bathroom takes around 3-5 hours. The new pod bathrooms are installed in the same position as the existing units, although they are about 0.6m deeper and 0.15m higher. The design and layout of the new bathrooms was drawn up with the involvement of local residents and councillors.

2.4 **Details of Proposal:**

2.5 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension comprising a bathroom and utility room. The extension would have a depth of 3.98m, a width of 2.1m and a height of 3m. It would be faced in red / brown brick, have a flat black membrane finish roof and have a semi glazed door and obscure glazed window on its side west elevation.

2.6 **Significant amendments to application since submitted:** There have been no amendments to the proposal.

3.0 **PUBLICITY**

3.1 **Adjoining Occupiers Notified**

3.2 **Method of Notification:** This application was advertised by way of letter sent to the owners/ occupiers in the adjacent properties.

3.3 **Number of Letters Received:** None

3.4 **Addresses of letters:** Not applicable.

3.5 **Summary of material responses:** Not applicable

3.6 **Non-Material Responses:** Not applicable

3.7 **Official Consultation**

3.8 **Internal:** Not Applicable

3.9 **External:** None

3.10 **Councillor Representation:** None

4.0 **MATERIAL PLANNING POLICIES**

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that when determining a planning application, regard is to be had to the development plan, and the determination shall be made in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the London Borough of Sutton comprises the following documents:

(1) The London Plan (originally adopted 2004, amended version, consolidated with alterations, adopted February 2008).

(2) The Sutton Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (adopted April 2003)

(3) The Local Development Framework (LDF) which is to replace the UDP in due course as the official Development Plan for the Borough. At present it comprises two main documents (additional ones for specific areas such as Sutton Town Centre will be produced):
-(a) The Core Planning Strategy (CPS) which sets out the Council's long term vision, spatial strategy and core policies for shaping the future development in the Borough and managing change over the next 15 years in line with the principles of sustainable development. The CPS has been the subject of public consultation and on 2.3.09 the Proposed Submission version was approved by the Full Council and since then its' policies have to have been taken into account (ie are a material consideration) when determining applications. In June 2009 a formal public examination by Government Inspectors was held into the CPS. An amended version, taking into account the findings of the Inspectors, is to be presented to the Full Council on 7.12.09 for final and formal adoption.
-(b) The Site Development Policies (SDP) Preferred Options (Consultation Draft) which identifies sites for future development (outside Sutton Town Centre) and sets out detailed development management policies to be used to help decide planning applications. The SDP has been through two stages of public consultation and is to be presented to the Full Council on 7.12.09 for approval and subsequent submission to the Secretary of State. A further public consultation will be carried out in January 2010. The SDP is likely to be the subject of a formal public examination by Government Inspectors in October 2010. At present the SPD only has limited weight as a material consideration in deciding planning applications and it is not yet appropriate to list the relevant policies in Committee reports.

(4) The London Plan: Consultation draft replacement plan, October 2009.
This document, which will eventually replace the existing consolidated version of the London Plan, has been published for public consultation until 12

January 2010. A public Examination is likely to be held in Summer/Autumn 2010. Although the draft replacement plan will not supersede the existing London Plan until after it has been formally adopted, the draft plan will be a material consideration that should be taken into account in deciding planning applications and will gather increasing weight the further into the replacement process.

In the event that there are discrepancies between the adopted CPS, SDP and Replacement London Plan, legal guidance indicates that the latest adopted document prevails.

4.2 Sutton Unitary Development Plan

- BE15 – Design of Residential Extensions

4.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Supplementary Planning Document 4 – Design of Residential Extensions

5.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

5.1 The principal considerations (including whether any material planning objections have been reasonably addressed) in relation to this application are:

- **Principle of Development**
- **Design Quality**
- **Impact on Neighbours**
- **Access**
- **Other Relevant Material Planning Considerations**
- **Considerations Relating to Other Objections:**

5.2 **Principle of Development:**

5.3 The accommodation contained in this extension would provide much improved bathroom and storage facilities and is welcome in principle providing its design and impact on its neighbours are acceptable.

5.4 **Design Quality:**

5.5 It is considered that the scale, design and materials of the extension would reasonably respect those of the existing house. Although, the red / brown bricks would not be an exact match of the existing red / orange bricks it is felt they are acceptable in the context of the finishes available for pod bathrooms, that it would be a better match than the red brick faced extension it replaced, and being located to the rear would not be visible from the street.

5.6 **Impact on Neighbours:**

5.7 The extension at 3.98m depth would be nearly 1.3m more than the 2.7m maximum depth advised for terraced houses in SPD4 (The Design of Residential Extensions). In addition, the 3m height would be greater than the 2.5m maximum advised by SPD4 for flat roofs.

5.8 However, it is considered that in this instance, the extension would not have an unreasonable adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining houses for the following reasons:

(1) The extension would only project 0.7m beyond the 3.28m depth of the rear extension currently located at the house and therefore would have little impact on the amenity of the occupiers at No. 17.

(2) The extension would be located 3.2m from the boundary with the other adjoining house at No. 13, a sufficient distance to ensure that the outlook of its occupiers would not be unreasonably affected. To prevent any undue overlooking from the side window it is recommended that a condition is imposed requiring that obscure glazing is installed and retained.

5.9 In considering this application three other matters are of relevance;

(a) the extension would replace an existing extension on the property, albeit the proposed extension would be 0.7m deeper and 0.15m higher;

(b) prior to 1st October 2008 the permitted development regulations stated that single storey rear extensions to single family terraced houses did not require planning permission if (amongst other requirements) they did not exceed 50 cubic metres; the extension would be only 25 cubic metres so would not have required permission prior to 1st October 2008; however the post 1st October 2008 permitted development regulations state that single storey rear extensions to terraced houses require planning permission if (amongst other requirements) they exceed 3m in depth; so the extension requires planning permission;

(c) no objections have been received from the adjoining occupiers.

5.10 **Access:**

5.11 Policy BE9 states that the Council will cater for the needs of the disabled in terms of accessibility into new or existing developments. The proposed extension allows for level access from the house itself and as such there is no need for a condition requiring the entrance to have a level threshold.

5.12 **Other Relevant Material Planning Considerations:** None

5.13 **Considerations Relating to Other Objections:** None

6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1 This application to erect a single storey extension is considered acceptable as it would reasonably respect the scale and character of the existing house and would not unreasonably adversely affect the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

6.2 It is recommended that permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the Agenda.

Background Papers: C2009/62072/3FR

Drawings and other documents can be viewed on line –

1) Go to page: http://82.43.4.135/FASTWEB/welcome.asp
2) Enter Planning Application Number: **C2009/62072**
3) Click on Search and View Current Applications
4) Click on View Plans & Documents

G

Mr Andy Moore
Sutton Housing Partnership
Sutton Gate 1 Carshalton Road
Sutton
SM1 4LE

C2009/62072/3FR

DRAFT

WARNING: It is in your interests to ensure you obtain the approval of the Local Planning Authority, where the conditions require that to occur. Failure to comply with the following conditions may lead to enforcement action to secure compliance.

FIRST SCHEDULE

15 LINDORES ROAD Carshalton Surrey SM5 1BQ

Erection of a single storey rear extension to provide replacement bathroom

SECOND SCHEDULE

(1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date hereof.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

(2) The glazed bathroom window in the permitted extension shall be obscure glazed prior to its occupation and shall be retained in that form as long as the development is in existence.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

(3) The permitted extension shall be clad in Olde Inish Novabrick Panels, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the extension is of satisfactory appearance.

INFORMATIVES.

(1) Should you require details of the consideration of the application that has led to this decision, the file may be inspected under the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985. An appointment can be made for this purpose by telephoning 020 8770-5700.

(2) This application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Sutton Unitary Development Plan. The proposal is generally in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and for this reason planning permission is granted.

(3) The drawing no(s). relating to this decision are 1 and 2.