



CROYDON
www.croydon.gov.uk

Crown Copyright Ordnance Survey (License No: 100019257) 2011

London Borough Croydon

Scale 1:1250

14-Jun-2016



PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE AGENDA

8th September 2016

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.3

1 APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: [16/03110/P](#) (*link to associated files on the Planning Register*)
Location: 53 Chapel View, South Croydon, CR2 7LJ
Ward: Selsdon and Ballards
Description: Retention of single storey side and rear extensions
Drawing Nos: Site Plan 1:1250, A01 A, A02, A03, A04, A05, A06, A07
Applicant: Mr Uchuvatov
Case Officer: Louise Tucker

- 1.1 This application is being reported to committee because the ward councillor (Cllr Sara Bashford) made representations in accordance with the Committee Consideration Criteria and requested committee consideration.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The principle of residential extensions are acceptable.
- 2.2 The development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area.
- 2.3 The development would not have a detrimental impact 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 and Strategic Transport is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

- 1) In accordance with submitted drawings
- 2) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

Informatives

- 1) Removal of Site Notices
- 2) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 Full planning permission is sought for the retention of a single storey side and single storey rear extension. At the time of the officer site visit, works to the extensions were near completion. The description has been updated to reflect this.
- 4.2 The single storey side extension is 3m in width and 7m in depth, with a flat roof. Where land levels rise steeply towards the rear of the site, the height of the extension at the front is approximately 4.1m, and to the rear is approximately 3.6m. A window has been inserted into the front of the extension serving a bedroom, with an obscure glazed window to the rear serving an ensuite bathroom.
- 4.3 The single storey rear extension is 4m in depth, 5.75m in width and 3.5m in height with a flat roof. Sliding doors have been inserted into the rear of the extension, with two rooflights. The plans show the extension is to be used as a kitchen.
- 4.4 A Lawful Development Certificate was granted in December 2015 for the erection of a single storey side and single storey rear extension (application reference number 15/04706/LP). Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 states that if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse is within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, the height of the eaves of the enlarged part cannot exceed 3 metres. The eaves height of the extensions as built are 3.1m in height (side extension) and 3.1m in height (rear extension) respectively, so the extensions fall outside the scope of permitted development and require planning permission.

Site and Surroundings

- 4.5 The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling on the north eastern side of Chapel View in South Croydon. A single storey rear extension and detached side garage were demolished to make way for construction of the new extensions.
- 4.6 The site is not subject to any designations within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) map, but does border Metropolitan Green Belt to the rear and is sited opposite a Shopping Parade. Land levels rise steeply towards the rear of the site.

Planning History

- 4.7 15/02341/P – Erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension – Permission refused
15/04706/LP – Erection of single storey side and rear extensions – Certificate granted

16/02756/P – Retention of alterations to land levels, retaining walls and boundary fencing to rear – Under consideration on this committee agenda

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 one or more site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc. in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 5 Objecting: 5 Supporting: 0

6.2 The following Councillor made representations:

- Councillor Sara Bashford [objecting]

6.3 The following Resident's Association made representations:

- Croham Valley Resident's Association [objecting]

6.4 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

- Out of character with the area
- Extensions too large in mass and dominance
- Loss of light and privacy
- Overdevelopment

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

- Applicant has carried out works without planning permission [OFFICER COMMENT: Consideration of the application is not affected by the works having been undertaken, a decision can be made retrospectively and works without planning consent were undertaken at the risk of the applicant]
- The height of the rear and side extensions exceed permitted development limits so the planning application should be refused [OFFICER COMMENT: Permitted development requirements allow certain works to be carried out without the need for planning permission. Works outside the scope of permitted development require planning permission and allow the Council to consider the merits of the scheme]

- The increase in height to the extension is unnecessary and not required [OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration]
- Applicant intends to carry out works to the front garden [OFFICER COMMENT: There are no works proposed to the front garden as part of this application]
- The applicant has carried out works outside the scope of the application originally submitted (reference 15/04706/LP) [OFFICER COMMENT: The works carried out in pursuance of this consent have been built larger than is acceptable under permitted development, the applicant has submitted this planning application to regularise the situation and gain full planning consent for the works]

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- 1) The design and appearance of the development and its effect upon the character and appearance of the area
- 2) The impact of the development upon the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers
- 3) Highways impact

The design and appearance of the development

- 7.2 London Plan Policies 7.4 Local Character and 7.6 Architecture state that development should have regard to the character of the area, and that architecture should make a positive contribution to the public realm. Policies SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) (CLP) reiterate this and state that development should be of high quality design, enhance Croydon's varied character and be informed by the Places of Croydon. Furthermore, the relevant Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013 (the UDP) include UD2 which covers "the layout and siting of new development" and UD3 which covers "the scale and design of new buildings". Supplementary Planning Document No. 2 (SPD2) on Residential Extensions and Alterations provides detailed guidance on the design of household extensions.
- 7.3 SPD2 requires single storey rear extensions to be subordinate to the original house, and the roof should be 'appropriate to the particular house and context'. It goes on to state that single storey side extensions should not normally project in front of the existing house, and should normally be set back by at least 215mm (1 brick) from the main front wall of the dwellinghouse.
- 7.4 In the main the extensions to the property are classed as permitted development, as was confirmed through the grant of a Lawful Development Certificate in December 2015 (see planning history). The only change from this previous consent is the increased eaves height, and the resultant increase in overall

height of the extensions. This increase in height amounts to 0.15m for the side extension, and 0.1m for the rear extension.

- 7.5 Whilst the side extension is flush with the main front wall of the property, the development is single storey, of a subordinate width and has a separation distance of around 0.4m from the side boundary, ensuring there is no terracing effect as a result of the development. The extension has replaced a detached side garage, which, along with side extensions, are common in the Chapel View streetscene, most having either a flat roof or a dummy pitch roof to the front. The extension has been finished in materials to match the existing property. A side extension of a similar appearance and form could be built under permitted development. It is not considered the side extension appears sufficiently out of character with the streetscene to justify refusing planning permission. This aspect of the scheme is considered acceptable.
- 7.6 The single storey rear extension would be 4m in depth with a flat roof. The development would have no visibility in the streetscene. The development replaced an existing single storey flat roofed extension of similar appearance, and other flat roofed extensions are common to the rear of properties in the area, including on the immediate neighbouring properties. The property is detached and benefits from a substantial rear garden. Spacing to the boundary with no 55 has been retained. It is not considered the rear extension would result in significant harm to character to justify refusing planning permission on these grounds. This part of the scheme is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.7 Taking into account what could be constructed under permitted development and the scale and form of the development, it is not considered the proposal would cause sufficient undue harm to the host property or the character of the surrounding area, in accordance with policies UD2 and UD3 of the UDP and SPD2.

The residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers

- 7.8 The policies quoted above refer to the relationship of development to the surrounding area and are of relevance when considering the impact of development on adjoining occupiers. Policy UD8 of the UDP aims to protect residential amenity and requires the Council to have regard to the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of surrounding buildings when considering development proposals.
- 7.9 As noted above, SPD2 states that the maximum acceptable projection beyond the rear of the neighbouring building on a semi-detached property is 3m. Where properties are detached, a larger extension may be permissible. As previously noted, a rear extension of 4m in depth could be built on the property under permitted development. The flank wall of the rear extension is well separated from the main rear wall of no. 55, and so would not result in any harmful loss of light or outlook into rear windows on this property, which is on a higher land level. The rear extension would be set away from no.51, which has been extended to

the rear at single storey level also. There are no side windows in the rear extension, so there would not be a loss of privacy to either of the neighbouring properties. Therefore it is not considered the rear extension would result in a detrimental impact to the residential amenities of either neighbouring property, this element of the scheme is considered acceptable and in accordance with policy.

- 7.10 The side extension would be close to a neighbouring side window in the flank wall of no. 51. Representations on the application suggest that this window serves a kitchen. Given the single storey nature of the development, that a degree of separation to the boundary has been retained, the use of a flat roof, the previous siting of a garage along this side and the permitted development fall back position, it is not considered that loss of light and outlook into this window would be so severe that it would justify refusing planning permission. The side extension would not project beyond the rear wall of no. 51, and as such would not harm any light or outlook into any rear windows. There are no side windows in this extension so privacy would not be an issue. This element of the scheme is therefore acceptable in terms of impact on residential amenity.
- 7.11 For the above reasons, it is considered the impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties is acceptable and in accordance with policy UD8 and SPD2.

The highways impact

- 7.12 The construction of the side extension has resulted in the loss of a garage and one parking space. Given the property benefits from a front driveway providing space for at least one car, the loss of the garage is considered acceptable and would not result in increased pressure on parking facilities in the local area. This would be in accordance with policy T2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013.

Conclusions

- 7.13 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.