



PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.3

1 APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 16/05868/FUL
Location: 240A Wickham Road, Croydon, CR0 8BJ
Ward: Heathfield
Description: Erection of part single/two storey side and first floor extension and flat roof single storey link extension
Drawing Nos: W214.I/H/00, E-W214.3-V-14/1, E-W214.3-V-14/2, E-W214.3-V-19/7 and E-W214.3-V-19/8,
Agent: Richard Turnball, FullerLong Limited
Applicant: Fox Umbrella
Case Officer: John Asiamah

- 1.1 This application is being reported to Committee because the ward councillor (Cllr Jason Cummings) made representations in accordance with the Committee Consideration Criteria and requested Planning Committee Consideration and objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

2 SUMMARY OF MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- The proposal would not have an unduly harmful effect on the character of the area or the appearance of the area.
- The proposal would, on balance, have an acceptable impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.
- The proposal would have no significant adverse impact on parking, pedestrian and highway safety.

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 implemented in accordance with the approved plans

- 2) No windows in the south-western and south-eastern elevations other than as specified in the application
- 3) The first floor windows in the south-eastern elevation to be fixed-shut and obscure-glazed
- 4) Noise assessment and mitigation measures
- 5) Submission of sustainable drainage details
- 6) Materials to match the existing
- 7) Time limit of 3 years
- 8) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport.

Informatives

- 1) Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 2) Site Notice removal
- 3) Code of Practice – Construction Sites
- 4) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

4 PROPOSALS AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

4.1 Full planning permission is sought for:

- Erection of single/ two storey side and first floor extension and creation of a flat roof single storey link extension

4.2 The overall depth of the proposed development be approximately 17.4m in width, 8.8m in depth and 7-7.2m in height. The proposed additions would be used for storage and workshop.

4.3 The proposal is amendment to a previously refused scheme (16/00328/P). The amendment involves a break between the proposed addition and the existing building at first floor level.

Site and Surroundings

4.4 The application site is located on the southern side of Wickham Road and at the rear of number 230 to 244 Wickham Road. The site is occupied by a detached light industrial building.

4.5 The surrounding area is mix in character and is made up of commercial units. There is no direct policy constraint on the site but it adjoins Local Centre and Primary Shopping Area as identified in the Croydon Local Plan Proposal Map.

Planning History

4.6 The following are recent planning decisions on the site:

- 59/668: Planning permission was granted on appeal in 1959 for warehouse building.
- 03/01281/P: Planning permission was granted in December 2003 for demolition of a workshop building, garage and hardstandings; Alterations and new entrance to remaining building; Erection of single storey extension with mezzanine storage area above comprising of 2 business units within Class B1 (business); Provision of 5 parking spaces.
- 05/04599/P: Planning permission was granted in January 2006 for demolition of a workshop building, garage and hardstandings; Alterations and new entrance to remaining building; Erection of single storey extension with mezzanine storage area above comprising of 2 business units within Class B1 (business); Provision of 5 parking spaces. This permission has been implemented.
- 14/00243/P: Planning permission was granted in May 2014 for erection of two storey side extension including use of new roof space and alterations to existing parking. This permission has been implemented.
- 15/00653/P: Application for planning permission for the erection of two storey side extension was refused in May 2015. Refused on grounds of: (1) harm to the character and appearance of the locality and detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene; and (2) harm to the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.

Appeal dismissed on grounds of harm to the character and appearance of the area.

- 16/00328/P: Application for planning permission for the erection of two storey side extension was refused in May 2015. Refused on grounds of: (1) harm to the character and appearance of the locality and detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene.

Appeal dismissed on grounds of harm to the character and appearance of the area.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

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

No of individual responses: 46 Objecting: 34 Supporting: 11

No of petitions received: 1 objecting containing 66 signatories

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:

Objecting

- The proposal is similar to the previous schemes which were refused and dismissed at appeal
- Not in keeping with the area
- Overdevelopment
- Poor design
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Detrimental impact on trees
- The proposal is contrary to national and local policies
- Visual intrusion
- Noise and disturbance
- Increase in parking demand
- The amendments are not sufficient
- The development is not appropriate for the area
- Detrimental impact on the surrounding highway
- Obstruction by delivery vehicles

Supporting

- The proposal would provide jobs
- The proposal would create jobs
- The proposal would benefit the employees
- Positive impact on the area
- The proposal respect and protect the amenities of the adjoining occupiers
- The proposal would provide quality accommodation for staff
- The proposal is an improvement compared to the previous schemes

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the Committee must consider are:
1. The impact on the character and appearance of the area
 2. The impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers
 3. The impact on parking demand and highway safety

The Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

- 7.2 Policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan indicate that development should make a positive contribution to the local character, public realm and streetscape. Policy SP1.1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies indicates that the Council will require all new development to contribute to enhancing a sense of place and improving the character of the area. Policies SP4.1 and SP4.2 also require development to be of a high quality which respects and enhances local character. Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Plan (2006) Saved Policies 2013 require the siting, layout and form of new development to respect the character and appearance of existing areas.
- 7.3 The site is situated at the rear of properties fronting Wickham Road and West Way Gardens but it is visible from both roads. There have been substantial additions to the existing property over the years. It occupies the full width of the site. The western half of the building, at a single storey in height and slightly shorter depth, is subservient in scale to the two storey eastern half of the building. As a result, in scale and form the building fits in with the area.
- 7.4 The proposal is amendment to a previously refused scheme (16/00328/P). The current proposal involves a break between the proposed addition and the existing building at first floor level and a reduced ridge height. The gap at first floor level and the reduced ridge height would break down the mass and ensure that the scale of the overall building does not dominate its surroundings.
- 7.5 In the previously dismissed scheme (16/00382/P), the Inspector considered that: *“The massing of the proposed extension when viewed from the rear would be more successfully articulated with a clear and material break about half way along, as the ridge would drop by 900mm along with a setback at first floor. However, no clear set back is proposed where the extension would join the host building as the roof plane and wall would run seamlessly through. The only articulation would be the 200mm drop in the ridge. But this alone would not be sufficient to provide material and adequate articulation between old and new or reduce the considerable scale and massing that would result from the width of the extended building. I therefore consider the extension would harm the character and appearance of the area.”*
- 7.6 The break between the proposed addition and the existing building at first floor level and the reduced ridge height would provide material and adequate articulation between old and new, reducing the scale and massing of the

proposed development. Therefore, the concerns raised by the Inspector have been adequately addressed in the current proposal.

- 7.7 Consequently, it is concluded that the proposal would not have undue impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would thereby comply with the objectives of Policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015), Policies SP1.1, SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and Policies UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013.

The Impact on the Residential Amenities of the Adjoining Occupiers

- 7.8 Policy 7.1 of the London Plan indicates that in their neighbourhoods, people should have a good quality environment. Policy UD8 of the Croydon Plan (2006) Saved Policies 2013 requires the Council to have regard to the privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers. Policy EP1 of the Croydon Plan (2006) Saved Policies 2013 aims to control potentially polluting uses. 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.
- 7.9 Harm to neighbouring occupiers did not provide grounds for dismissal of the previous schemes on appeal and the current revised schemes would be no worse in that respect.
- 7.10 In the previously dismissed scheme (15/00653/P), the Inspector considered that: *“The western side of the front of the building is parallel to and faces the rear of the two storey apartment building containing 230 to 236 Wickham Road. The proposed addition of a second storey would extend across the outlook from the rear of these dwellings. However, it would have a limited height to eaves level of 4.7m and a gap, measured at the site visit, of some 18m separating the facing elevations. As a result, the extension would be located sufficiently far away for it not to be overbearing in views from within these dwellings, or from within their private amenity spaces to the rear.”*
- 7.11 The height of the current proposal would be slightly less than the previously dismissed scheme and the separating distance would be the same. Consequently, given the Inspector’s consideration, it is considered that the proposal would have no undue impact on the visual amenities of the adjoining occupiers.
- 7.12 In terms of the relationship with No. 11A West Way Gardens, the Inspector considered that: *“11A West Way Road is a bungalow located on the western side of the appeal site. The gable end of the Fox Umbrellas building positioned close to the side of the appeal site encloses the side of its short back garden. As measured by the parties at the site visit, the building projects 3m beyond the*

rear elevation of the dwelling. Given the degree to which the adjacent neighbouring bedroom is set away from the side boundary, the addition of a first floor to the building would not adversely enclose the outlook from within this room. The conservatory attached to the rear of No 11A is used as a dining room. The proposed extension, whose gable end would be also be approximately 4.7m tall to eaves level, would be visible in views from the side of the conservatory. However, in my assessment, an extended building of the height proposed would be sufficiently far away so as not to be overbearing to the outlook from within the conservatory. Whilst it would enclose the side of the area of decking that has been created in the north eastern corner of the rear garden, the back garden is wide and above the height of its boundary treatment its other sides are open. Outlook from within the rear garden would not therefore be adversely affected to a significant degree.”

- 7.13 The Inspector also considered that: *“The rear elevation of the extended building, off set at an angle, would be visible from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties, 11 & 13 West Way Road. However, whilst the presence of the extended building would alter the outlook from the rear of these dwellings it would not be so close as to be overbearing.”*
- 7.14 The siting of the current proposal is similar to the previous scheme therefore the relationship would be acceptable.
- 7.15 In terms of loss of privacy, the previous Inspector considered that the use of obscure glazing to all windows on the first floor extension would prevent overlooking of the apartments on Wickham Road. The Inspector also considered that although windows in the first floor extension would face the gardens of 11 and 13 West Way Gardens, they would do so at an angle and they would be obscured glazed and overlooking from this elevation would not occur. The siting of the current proposal would be the same as the previous scheme and the first floor windows would be obscure-glazed. Therefore, there can be no objection to the proposal on loss of privacy grounds.
- 7.16 Concerns have been raised regarding potential increase in noise and disturbance. The Pollution Team have confirmed that in the last 5 years, they have received one complaint (received on 3rd November 2016) regarding constant noise from a generator all day. However, they have indicated that an officer attended the site at 13.30 and no noise was heard. The officer waited a while and no noise was witnessed. The officer also visited the neighbour and was shown to the back of the premises with an air pump and compressor it was enclosed in a wooden housing. It was established that it is only used intermittently between 08.00 - 16.00hrs.
- 7.17 Given that the proposal would result in intensification of use, the applicant would be required through a planning condition to implement measures to

ensure that noise from equipment should be inaudible at the nearest residential property.

- 7.18 Consequently, it is considered that the proposal complies with the objectives of Policy 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) and Policies UD8 and EP1 of the Croydon Plan (2006) Saved Policies 2013 that seeks to protect existing occupiers from undue visual intrusion and loss of privacy.

The Impact on Parking Demand, Pedestrian and Highway Safety

- 7.19 The existing access, parking and service arrangements will remain the same. Furthermore, it is in a sustainable location. Consequently, the proposal would have no significant adverse impact on parking, pedestrian and highway safety

Other Planning Issue

- 7.20 Policy SP6.4 requires development to utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs) to reduce surface water run-off and provide water treatment on site. The site is not in a Flood Zone, according to Environment Agency maps. However the site does fall within a 1 in 30 year Surface Water Flood Risk Area. A House of Commons: Written Statement of 18th April 2014 specified that Local Planning Authorities should statutorily consult the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that SUDs for the management of water run-off are put in place and are adequate. The Statement sets out that this only applies to major developments comprising of 10 or more dwellings, or an equivalent non-residential or mixed development (as set out in Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010. This application is not classified as a major development, given the nature of the proposal. Therefore it is considered that SUDs details can be secured through a condition, along with building resilience measures to be incorporated into the building.

Conclusions

- 7.20 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.