



PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision**Item 6.2**

1 APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 16/05182/HSE
Location: 74 Sanderstead Court Avenue, South Croydon, CR2 9AJ
Ward: Sanderstead
Description: Alterations, construction of first floor and erection of single storey rear extension
Drawing Nos: Job No 32902 – Location Plan; Existing Floor Plans and Elevations; Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations
Applicant: Mr and Mrs Wise
Agent: Cameron Jones Planning
Case Officer: Andy Day

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

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- Residential extensions at this site are acceptable in principle.
- The proposal would respect the character of the area and the street scene.
- The proposal would have minimal effect on the visual amenities of the adjoining Green Belt
- The size and siting of the proposed extensions would be acceptable sufficient to ensure minimal impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.
- The proposal would be acceptable with regards to the accommodation for future occupiers
- The proposal would incorporate parking provision, turning arrangements would be acceptable and due regard to highway safety has been taken.

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) In accordance with plans
- 2) Materials to match those existing
- 3) Window restrictions
- 4) Commence within 3 years
- 5) 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

3.3 Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 places a duty on Local Planning Authorities to ensure whenever appropriate when granting planning permission that adequate provision is made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees.

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

4.1 During the course of consideration the description of development has changed to include works to the garage, and these result in its increase in size to the side and rear. The applicant seeks full planning permission for the:

- Alterations, and construction of first floor to replace an existing room in the roof
- Erection of single storey side and rear extension

Site and Surrounding Area

4.2 The application site is located on the south-eastern side of Sanderstead Court Avenue, the part comprising a spur off the main section of road. It is adjacent to Selsdon Park Golf Course which lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The area contains mainly detached and semi-detached properties, some bungalows, but mostly two storey houses, built in different styles and of varying periods. Most properties sit in spacious grounds. Nos 72 and 74 are both bungalows, whereas Nos 63, 63A, 66, 57, 59, 61, 41 and 39 are two storey houses.

4.3 The ground falls from north to south and less so from west to east. Nos 72 and 74 are at similar levels as each other, slightly below footway level and certainly below the levels of Nos 63 and 63A opposite. .

Planning History

4.4 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

16/02253/P: Construction of first floor and erection of single storey rear extension. This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

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 Sanderstead Court Avenue and Sanderstead Court Avenue (spur). 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: 7 Objecting: 3 Supporting: 4

6.2 The following Councillor made representations:

- Councillor Lynne Hale [objecting]

6.3 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

- Over intensification of the site due to scale, bulk and massing
- Detrimental to adjoining occupiers due to size and siting
- Impact on the Green Belt through visual intrusion
- Visual intrusion to a side kitchen window and from patio
- The two bungalows are presently in keeping with the character of the area
- Increase in traffic generation
- Noise and disturbance

Support

- Most houses have extensions
- Similar to other developments in the area
- Would create a family home in keeping with the character of the area

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 and appearance of the surrounding area.
2. The impact on the visual amenities of the adjoining Green Belt
3. The impact of the development upon the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.
4. Access, parking and turning arrangements

The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area

7.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires planning applications to be determined with a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

7.3 Chapter 6 of the NPPF indicates that housing applications should be considered in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that it is the role of local planning authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

7.4 London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 require planning decisions to have regard to local character and for development to comprise details and materials that complement, not necessarily replicate the local architectural character. Policy SP4 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (CLP1) 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. Saved Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Plan 2006 (Saved Policies 2013)(UDP) require the siting, layout and form of new development to respect the character and appearance of existing areas.

- 7.5 Supplementary Planning Document No 2 – Residential Extensions and Alterations, does not provide specific guidance on proposals to add first floors to single storey properties. Although the general advice concerning each application being considered on its own planning merits and a broad objective to improve the overall design quality of the environment must still apply.
- 7.6 The proposal would comprise alterations to the existing building, extensions to the rear and side of the building at ground floor level and the construction of an additional floor, with pitched roof, above the main part of the bungalow and also the extended garage. There is already a room in the roof of the existing bungalow. The width of the first floor part of the construction would be 8.4m at its widest, although the element above the garage would appear subordinate to the new main roof. The depth of the first floor would be 11.2m. It would project around 2m beyond No 72 at first floor level. The ground floor would project 3m beyond the existing bungalow. The first floor part of the extension would be around 5.1m from the boundary with No 72.
- 7.7 An earlier application was withdrawn by the applicant (16/02253/P). The final scheme at the time of withdrawal was deeper at ground and first floor level, but less wide at first floor level. That proposal did not include a larger garage widened to support an additional floor above.
- 7.8 In terms of the effect on the character of the area and the appearance of the street scene, the first floor element would appear much larger, made more apparent by the bungalow at No 72 being positioned between two large houses. However, because the area has single storey and two storey buildings inter-mingled, with lots of examples of houses next to bungalows, and with the differences in levels locally resulting in buildings stepping up and down next to each other, on balance, it would be difficult to justify refusing permission on this basis. Also of note is that the additional floor would be set away from the boundary and an existing single storey element would be the nearest part of the application premises to the nearest adjoining building, thereby assisting the transition between the proposal and the single storey building next door. The impact on the visual amenities of the green belt is addressed below.
- 7.9 On this basis, it is not considered that there are sound policy objections to refuse permission on impact on the character of the area or the appearance of the street scene grounds, and the proposal is considered acceptable.

The impact on the visual amenities of the adjoining green belt

- 7.10 Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) attaches great importance to Green Belts, with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics

of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that: "As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances". Para 88 states that: "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations".

- 7.11 In terms of development that could affect the setting of the green belt, Policy RO6 of the Croydon Plan (2006) Saved Policies 2013 also indicates that development within or conspicuous from the Metropolitan Green Belt will not be accepted if it would harm visual amenity. It continues, land near green belt creates a setting. Gardens for example act as a buffer between built up areas and open land. The siting, materials, design and scale of development nearby will affect the visual amenity that they provide and so must be considered and controlled.
- 7.12 The proposed house, being wider, deeper and higher than the existing bungalow, would appear more prominent when viewed from Sanderstead Court Avenue, towards the green belt and also more prominent from those views from within the green belt. However, there are other large houses on plots in the area, that also abut the green belt boundary. Furthermore, the extended building would be around 3m from the site boundary, with some planting in between. Overall, sufficient buffer would be retained and the visual amenity would not be seriously harmed.

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

- 7.13 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF indicates that decisions should "always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings". Policy 7.1 of the London Plan 2011 (with 2013 Alterations) indicates that in their neighbourhoods, people should have a good quality environment. Policies SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) seek to respect and enhance character, to create sustainable communities and enhance social cohesion and well-being. Policy UD2 of the UDP states that development proposals will be permitted provided that they allow adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate into and between buildings. While Policy UD8 states that "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 will have regard to the "maintenance of sunlight or daylight amenities for occupiers of adjacent properties".
- 7.14 The most affected neighbours would be the occupiers of No 72 to the south of the application site. The proposed extensions and new first floor would be higher and deeper when seen from the neighbouring property. The most affected parts of No 72 would be the kitchen/dining room which has a side window and side door facing the application site. The clear glazed window is next to the kitchen sink area of the kitchen and the obscure glazed door also serves the kitchen area. The dining part of the room also has a rear facing window. This room is open plan. The other part of the property most affected is the garden patio and side access way. The extensions would be seen from both but the garden is large and with plenty of aspect towards the trees within the Selsdon Park Golf Course to the rear. A two storey rear extension is also under construction at No 70 Sanderstead Court Avenue.

7.15 Having regard to the size and siting of the proposed works, there is no doubt that there would be some impact on the immediate neighbouring occupiers. However, on balance, taking account of the separation between the neighbouring bungalow and the first floor element of the extension, together with the boundary wall and hedge in between, the harm caused would not provide grounds to refuse permission on loss of light, loss of outlook or privacy grounds. The proposal would not seriously conflict with the relevant plan policies.

Access, parking and turning arrangements

7.16 Chapter 4 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport. Policy 6.13 of the London Plan indicates that a balance should be struck between promoting development and preventing an excessive parking provision. The Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) seek to ensure that sustainable transport will be promoted, that traffic generated by new development can be safely accommodated on the road network and that there is an appropriate level of car parking. Policy UD13 of the Croydon Plan (2006) Saved Policies 2013 requires car parking and access arrangements to be designed to be safe, secure, efficient and well designed. The existing access would be utilised to provide access to the proposed dwelling and is considered acceptable.

7.17 With the exception of a slightly larger garage, the access and parking arrangements would remain as they currently exist. Given the low level increase in vehicle movements anticipated, that the access position would not change and the minimal number of vehicle movements that occur generally in this section of Sanderstead Court Avenue, it is not considered that this development would harm the safety and efficiency of the highway network.

Conclusions

7.18 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.