

This page is intentionally blank



## 1 APPLICATION DETAILS

- 1.1 Ref: 15/04151/P  
Location: 78 Grecian Crescent, London, SE19 3HH  
Ward: Upper Norwood  
Description: Alterations; erection of single storey rear extension  
Drawing No.s: OS Map, 1543/05, 1543/06, 1543/07, 1543/10 (dated Nov. 2015),  
1543/11 (dated Nov. 2015) and 1543/12 (dated Nov. 2015)  
Applicant: Mr Taylor  
Agent: Mr Pierson  
Case Officer: Lauren McHugh
- 1.2 This application is being reported to committee because objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

## 2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the dwellinghouse and the visual amenity of the streetscene.
- The proposal is not considered to result in harm to the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

## 3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission.
- 3.2 That the Director of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

### Conditions

- 1) Materials to match the existing
- 2) Commence within 3 years
- 3) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

### Informatives

- 1) Site notice removal
- 2) Any informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

## 4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

### Proposal

- 4.1 Number 78 Grecian Crescent has been recently extended without planning permission and this site is currently subject to enforcement investigation under 15/00346/C. The Enforcement Officer has measured the dormer extension and gable end roof extension and both fall within the remit of permitted development and

therefore planning permission is not required. However, the building works also comprised of a part-two storey, part-single storey rear extension, which involved the removal of a pre-existing single storey rear extension. The new part-two, part-single storey rear extension did not meet the requirements of permitted development. Specifically, the single storey element was sited within 2 metres of the boundary and the height to the eaves of the whole structure exceeded 3 metres. This was the case on site, at the time the current application (15/04151/P) was submitted on 16/09/2015. The applicant was given two options, to either apply for the part-single storey and part-two storey extension as one full planning application or to remove the previously erected single storey element and seek to prove that the two storey element constitutes permitted development. On the basis that the two storey extension as built does not require planning permission, the applicant could then have the option to continue with the current application (15/04151/P) for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

- 4.2 The applicant opted to demolish the single storey element. This was confirmed by the Enforcement Officer on a site visit on 02/10/2015. Therefore, the two storey rear extension is no longer sited within 2 metres of the boundary and now constitutes permitted development. This is shown in the existing drawings submitted with the application and reflects the extensions on site, as of 02/10/2015. Once these issues had been clarified, the full planning application for the single storey rear extension could continue.
- 4.3 The applicant seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension to infill the area to the side of the lawful two storey rear extension. Amended plans were received during the course of the application, showing an increase in the height of the single storey element from 3.0 metres to 3.5 metres. The single storey extension would measure 3.0 metres in depth and 2.45 metres in width. The extension would measure 2.9 metres to the eaves and would feature a part-sloping, part-flat roof. The flat roof would measure 3.5 metres at its highest point. The extension would feature coloured render and would comprise of a tiled roof. A set of bi-fold doors would be provided across the rear elevation of the single storey addition and the existing two storey rear extension.

### **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.4 The site is located on the eastern side of Grecian Crescent in Upper Norwood. The site is not designated by the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013).
- 4.5 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising mainly of semi-detached pairs on the eastern side of Grecian Crescent and modern detached properties to the opposite side of the road.

### **Planning History**

- 4.6 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

15/03450/P: Erection of two storey three bedroom detached house at side.

**Decision Pending**

15/02097/P: Erection of two storey five bedroom detached house at side with accommodation in roofspace. **Permission refused** on grounds of the proposal being out of keeping with the character of the locality, detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and visually intrusive for adjoining occupiers

92/00212/P: Erection of single storey rear extension. **Permission granted**

## 5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

## 6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

6.1 The application has been publicised by way of 2 site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site. The number of representations received from neighbours/local groups in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 13      Objecting: 13      Supporting: 0

6.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

### Objections

- Inaccuracies in the planning statement and drawings.
- The original single storey extension was not removed. This means that the two storey extension cannot come under permitted development.
- The original extension has stayed in place and the height increased by approximately 600 mm at the same time the second floor was added.
- Single storey encroaches over the boundary with number 76 and this is not shown on the drawings. The plans also show a gap which is not as built. [OFFICER COMMENT: The application is for a proposed development and not for the retention of an existing structure on site. As such, the application will be assessed on the basis of the drawings submitted. These drawings demonstrate that the proposed extension would be contained within the site boundaries.]
- In conjunction with the proposed 3 bedroom house, it will be totally imposing to the houses behind in Queen Mary Road. [OFFICER COMMENT: The application is for the erection of a single storey extension only. The impact of the proposed 3 bedroom house to the side of number 78 Grecian Crescent is considered separately under 15/3450/P.]
- Height and scale
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Visual intrusion
- Planning permission should be passed before any works started
- The extensions shown on the existing plans have never been built

- It is appalling that the council have allowed this house to be near completion without having put a stop to these works.
- The kitchen extension is higher than previous one and with an added storey on top of it.
- Out of proportion with other houses in Grecian Crescent
- Height is more than 3 metres
- Workmen are currently taking down part of the roof in readiness for an Inspector to visit tomorrow.
- Most of the original garden to the rear has been taken away
- Cannot recall an existing single storey rear extension built in the 1980s as I only have papers that relate to the single storey rear extension for 1992
- Loss of outlook as the roofline is higher than the original
- Internal kitchen layout drawing is different to arrangement on site

6.3 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:

- Nothing in writing regarding Party Wall Act [OFFICER COMMENT: This is a civil matter.]
- Where there was damage this has mostly been put right [OFFICER COMMENT: This is a civil matter.]
- Concern that the foundations are not strong enough to support a two storey structure [OFFICER COMMENT: This is a Building Control matter.]
- Chimney stack has been removed but this is not shown on proposed roof plan. Is this safe? [OFFICER COMMENT: This is a Building Control matter.]

6.4 Councillor John Wentworth expressed an interest in this case. Specifically, concerns were raised with regards to the enforcement issues at the site and the accuracy of the submitted plans.

## **7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

1. The impact of the development upon the character of the area and the visual amenity of the streetscene;
2. The impact of the development upon the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers;

### **The impact of the development upon the character of the area and the visual amenity of the streetscene**

7.2 Policy SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) concerns Urban Design & Local Character. SP4.1 is of particular relevance to this proposal which states that the Council will require development of a high quality, which respects and enhances Croydon's varied local character and contributes positively to public

realm, landscape and townscape to create sustainable communities. The Council will apply a presumption in favour of development provided it meets the requirements of Policy SP4 and other applicable policies of the development plan. Policy UD2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013 states that “Development proposals will be permitted provided they reinforce and respect the development pattern, where they contribute to local character”. Policy UD3 requires development to “Respect the height and proportions of surrounding buildings”.

- 7.3 London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) Policy 7.4 also states that: *‘Development should have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings’*. Policy 7.6 of the London Plan states *‘Architecture should make a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, streetscape and wider cityscape. It should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context’*.
- 7.4 Supplementary Planning Document No.2 (SPD No.2) on ‘Residential Extensions and Alterations’ states that single storey rear extensions should be subordinate to the original dwellinghouse. It should be noted that the dwellinghouse has already been extended under permitted development and these extensions are not for consideration under this application. The single storey rear extension, subject of this application, would represent a modest addition to this already enlarged property. The extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of scale and design and is not considered to detract from the character of the host property. The painted render walls and roof tiles would be complimentary to the host dwelling, whilst the bi-fold door across the rear of the property is also considered to be acceptable in visual terms.
- 7.5 The extension would not be visible from within Grecian Crescent and therefore no harmful impacts are foreseen.

#### **The impact of the development upon the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers**

- 7.6 Policy UD8 states that the Council will have regard to the following factors when considering proposals for new residential development – (i) Form and layout of existing and adjacent buildings; (ii) privacy and amenity of occupiers of surrounding buildings ensuring that both new and existing occupiers are protected from undue visual intrusion and loss of privacy; and... (v) maintenance of sunlight or daylight amenities for occupiers of adjacent properties’.
- 7.7 The proposal should be considered in relation to the adjoining property at 76 Grecian Crescent and the properties to the rear at Queen Mary Road.
- 7.8 SPD No.2 states that the maximum acceptable projection beyond the rear of the neighbouring building for terraced and semi-detached dwellings is generally 3 metres, although on well separated detached dwellings, a larger extension may be permissible. The adjoining number 76 Grecian Crescent has not been extended and the proposed single storey element would therefore project by 3.0 metres beyond the windows on the main rear wall of this property. The roof would also slope away from the shared boundary. The depth and height of the extension is not

considered to result in undue visual intrusion or a loss of outlook for these adjoining occupiers.

- 7.9 Due to adequate separation distances, of at least 25 metres, the proposed single storey rear extension would not result in undue visual intrusion or a loss of light for the adjoining occupiers to the rear at Queen Mary Road. Furthermore, the extension would not compromise the privacy of these adjoining occupiers.

### **Conclusions**

- 7.10 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.