

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.1

1 APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: [16/01650/P](#) (*link to relevant documents on the Planning Register*)
 Location: 80 Tollers Lane, Croydon CR5 1BB
 Ward: Coulsdon East
 Description: Erection of single/two storey side extension
 Drawing Nos: 80_TL 11 rev D, 80_TL 12 rev C, 80_TL 13 rev C
 Applicant: Mrs Armstrong
 Agent: A. D. Architectural Design Ltd
 Case Officer: Hayley Crabb

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

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area, resulting in a subordinate extension as required by Supplementary Planning Document 2 “Residential Extensions and Alterations” (SPD2).
- 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) Development to be carried out in accordance with approved drawings
- 2) Construction details of gutter to be submitted and agreed
- 3) Not to be used as a separate unit
- 4) Materials to match the existing
- 5) Commence within 3 years
- 6) 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 The proposal is for the erection of a single/two storey side and rear extension and the enlargement of a dropped crossing. In detail:

- The side extension would be 2.5m wide, 1.5m from the furthest point forward of the existing property, 1m set back from the main front elevation and with a dropped ridge of approximately 0.5m. It would be depth of the existing house, which is approximately 0.75m deeper than 82 Tollers Lane.
- The single storey extension would replace part of an existing detached garage and attach it to the main house
- The dropped crossing would be extended to 6m in width at the front

Site and Surroundings

4.2 The proposal is a two storey semi-detached property in a residential area generally characterised by detached and semi-detached residential properties. The application site has a catslide roof which comes to the ground floor above the existing porch. The street is made up of a variety of house types and most are not of this style; there is a mixed appearance to the streetscene.

Planning History

4.3 There is no planning history specific to this site which is of relevance.

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: 3 Objecting: 4

6.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Old Coulsdon Residents Association [objecting]

6.3 The following Councillor made representations:

- Councillor Bird [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

- The proposal represents overdevelopment and does not enhance the streetscene and results in the appearance of a terrace
- The proposal is not set back sufficiently and extends to the rear
- The proposal would result in additional parking

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

- The proposal could devalue properties (OFFICER COMMENT: property price is not material)
- The proposal would result in maintenance difficulties for the neighbouring property (OFFICER COMMENT: this is a civil matter between parties)
- The proposal could impact on the foundations of the neighbouring property (OFFICER COMMENT: this is covered by the Party Wall Act)
- Proposal would result in a separate unit (OFFICER COMMENT: the application is for a an extension to the existing house)

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Character and appearance of the street
2. Impact on residential amenity
3. Highways and parking

Character and appearance of the street

7.2 Policy UD2 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) states that development should reinforce and respect the existing pattern of development and amongst other things, address the street to provide active frontages. SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (CLP1) sets out that developments should be informed by the character of the area. SPD2 "Residential Extensions and Alterations" provides guidance on house extension design. It sets out that side extensions should be one third of the width of the existing house. They should also avoid creating a terracing effect and should be subservient to the host property. It suggests that these should be achieved by dropping the ridge line and setting the front elevation back from the main front elevation by 1.5m.

7.3 It should be noted that there are a variety of different house types and frontage widths along Tollers lane.

7.4 The extension would be less than a third of the width of the house and would be of a similar width to the existing rhythm of the building. The width of the proposal in principle is therefore considered to be acceptable.

7.5 The dominant roof form of the existing house is the catslide element of the roof. This forms the main front elevation due to the existing design of the property. The two storey side extension would be 2.5m wide (up to the side boundary of the site) and set back from the front elevation by 1.5m from the furthest forward existing front

elevation and 1m from the main front elevation. The ridge would be approximately 0.5m below the main ridge.

- 7.6 The proposal would be to the side boundary of the site and so would change the appearance of the two properties. The set back from the front elevation and dropped ridge line result in an extension subservient to the main house and legible as an extension. The neighbouring property is slightly in front of the front elevation of the application site, resulting in the proposal being less visible when approaching the site from the west. The terracing effect is considered to be on balance acceptable.
- 7.7 The originally proposed box gutter has been removed via amended plans and so the appearance of the proposal is considered acceptable. A condition is recommended to agree the construction details of the gutter.

Impact on residential amenity

- 7.8 As well as the above mentioned policies, policy UD8 of the UDP states that the impact of development on adjoining properties should protect residential amenity with regards to privacy, light and outlook. SPD2 states that single storey rear extensions should not be deeper than 3m depth to achieve this and that two-storey rear extensions are generally unacceptable.
- 7.9 The two storey element of the proposal would be the same depth as the existing house, which is approximately 1m deeper than the neighbouring property. Considering the orientation of the property and the location of windows in the neighbouring property's rear elevation, this is not considered to give rise to a significant impact on the neighbouring property.
- 7.10 The single storey rear extension would be 3m in depth from the original rear elevation, behind the proposed side extension. As such, it is in accordance with the general guidance. The roof form is not considered to give rise to a significantly impact on the neighbouring property so the impact on residential amenity is considered to be acceptable.

Other Planning Issues

- 7.11 Concerns have been raised about the formation of a separate unit. The proposal is for an extension to a house and the submitted plans show that it would be accessible from the main house on both levels. A condition is recommended to ensure that it is used as one unit.
- 7.12 The application originally included the enlargement of the existing dropped cross over. The site is not on a classified road, there is no existing boundary fence at the front of the property and the hardstanding is already in existence. This element of the proposal does therefore not require planning permission.

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.