



**CROYDON**  
www.croydon.gov.uk

Scale 1:1250

Crown Copyright Ordnance Survey (License No: 100019257) 2011

**London Borough Croydon**

13-Mar-2017



**PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision****Item 6.2****1 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS**

Ref: 16/05779/HSE  
Location: 15 Selcroft Road, Purley, CR8 1AG  
Ward: Purley  
Description: Erection of two/three storey side extension  
Drawing Nos: 3641 rev A received 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 3641 rev A received 22<sup>nd</sup> February,  
Site Location Plan  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Norris  
Agent: Mr Lee Richardson  
Case Officer: Louise Tucker

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

**2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission.
- 2.2 That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatics to secure the following matters:

**Conditions**

- 1) In accordance with approved plans
- 2) Materials to match the existing dwelling
- 3) No windows to be provided in the southern elevation
- 4) Commencement of development within three years of consent being granted
- 5) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

**Informatics**

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

**3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS****Proposal**

- Erection of two storey side extension (three storey at the rear where land levels fall steeply to the south west)

## **Site and Surroundings**

- Site is currently occupied by a large detached property with a prominent front bay feature
- Land levels fall towards the rear of the site, and from north to south meaning the property is on a higher land level than the neighbouring property, no.13
- Residential in character
- Surrounding properties are generally large detached buildings within generous plots of varying design
- The site is not subject to any designations as identified in the Croydon Local Plan Policies Map and there is no Tree Preservation Order covering the site

## **Planning History**

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

16/01328/P Demolition of garage; erection of two/three storey four bedroom detached house with integral garage

**Approved [not implemented]**

## **4 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- The proposed extension would be set back and set down from the main building, appearing sufficiently subservient to retain its integrity. The treatment of the elevations in terms of materials and features proposed would reflect the traditional appearance of the dwelling. The extension would appear as a two storey development from the front which would be in keeping with the surrounding streetscene. The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on the character of the streetscene and fully complies with Supplementary Planning Document 2 (SPD2).
- Whilst the nearest neighbouring property (no13) would be on a lower land level, the proposed extension would not project beyond the main rear wall and would be set back from the front elevation. Given the relationship of the buildings it is not considered there would be significant impact in terms of light and outlook. The extension would be in close proximity to a ground floor side window to no.14, but representations confirm this serves a utility room which is not a primary habitable room window. The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of the impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers.

## **5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 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: 12 Objecting: 8 Supporting: 4

6.2 Representations have been made from the following Resident's Association:

- Purley and Woodcote Residents' Association [objecting]

6.3 The following issues were raised in representations. Those that are material to the determination of the application, are addressed in substance in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section of this report:

<b>Summary of objections</b>	<b>Response</b>
The extension will result in a loss of light into a side window in the flank wall of no.13, given the change in land levels and the three storey nature of the development.	Representations indicate this window serves a utility room, this would not be considered a primary habitable room and already looks out onto the flank wall of the existing dwellinghouse. It is not considered a refusal of planning permission on the basis of the light and outlook into this window could be justified. The extension would be well spaced from the nearest habitable room windows on the front and rear of no.13.
The applicant states this is a two storey side extension, when it is a three storey side extension.	It is considered the description of development as given in this report –‘Erection of two/three storey side extension’ accurately describes the development.
The extension will be visually intrusive and result in overlooking of the neighbouring property, no.13.	There are no side windows proposed as part of the development. The proposed rear windows would have the same relationship with the neighbouring gardens as the rear window on the existing property. It is not considered there would be harm caused through loss of privacy.
The development will be out of character and appear cramped in the streetscene, with a blank side wall.	The development is considered to be subservient and sympathetic to the existing dwelling. Properties in the area tend to be large detached buildings of varying design, many which have been extended in varying forms.
A silver birch tree on the highway will have to be removed to accommodate a new vehicular access.	The tree will not be affected, the applicant has confirmed they will be utilising the existing access and rearranging the frontage to allow vehicular access, which can be carried out without requiring planning permission.
A new vehicular access will be required which will result in harm to the safety and efficiency of the highway.	There is no new vehicular access proposed, an existing vehicular access will be utilised.
<b>Summary of supporting comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
Design is in accordance with adopted planning guidance and	Addressed below in ‘MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS’

respects the character of the house	
Extension will provide improved living accommodation	Addressed below in 'MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS'
Development will improve the appearance of the street and is similar to many other extensions constructed in the road	Addressed below in 'MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS'
<b>Non-material issues</b>	<b>Response</b>
The maintenance of the roof and guttering of the new extension will be inaccessible given the proximity to the boundary.	This is a private matter and not a material planning consideration.
Objections have been submitted for reasons which are unrelated to the planning process	This is not a material planning consideration.

6.4 Councillor Simon Brew has made the following representations:

- Out of character with the streetscene by reason of proximity to neighbouring property
- Overbearing impact and overshadowing to the neighbouring property
- Building a basement extension in close proximity to no.13 will result in subsidence to their property [OFFICER COMMENT: Land stability can be a material planning consideration but a risk based approach should be taken in any assessment. In this case, there is an existing lower ground floor level in the property and given the change in land levels, there would not be significant excavation required to create a basement level in this location (particularly given the size of the basement level proposed). It is not considered there would be a significant impact on land stability as a result of the development, anything beyond this would be a private matter between the two properties]
- Neighbouring properties not shown on the drawings [OFFICER COMMENT: There is no requirement for neighbouring properties to be shown on the drawing]
- No Design & Access Statement has been submitted with the application [OFFICER COMMENT: There is no requirement for this to be submitted with this type of application]
- No prior consultation with the planning department has taken place [OFFICER COMMENT: The applicants have undertaken pre-application discussions with the Council]

## 7 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

7.1 In determining any planning application, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of its Development Plan so far as is material to the application and to any other material considerations and the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's adopted Development Plan consists of the Consolidated London Plan 2015, the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (CLP1), the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 Saved Policies 2013 (UDP) and the South London Waste Plan 2012. (This list and the paragraphs below, will need to include CLP1.1 and CLP2 once they have weight and become material planning considerations).

7.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in March 2012. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, requiring that development which accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF identifies a number of key issues for the delivery of sustainable development, those most relevant to this case are:

- Requiring good design.
- Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions

7.3 The main policy considerations raised by the application that the Committee are required to consider are:

Consolidated London Plan 2015 (LP):

- 7.4 on Local Character
- 7.6 on Architecture

Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (CLP1):

- SP1.2 Place Making
- SP4.1 & 4.2 Urban Design and Local Character

Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 Saved Policies 2013 (UDP):

- UD2 Layout and Siting of New Development
- UD3 Scale and Design of New Buildings
- UD8 Protecting residential amenity

There is relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance as follows:

- SPD2 Residential Extensions (LBC)

## **8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

1. Principle of development
2. Townscape and visual impact
3. Residential amenity
4. Highways and transport

### **Principle of development**

8.2 The principle of an extension to a residential property is acceptable. Properties in Selcroft Road and the surrounding area have extensions in a variety of scale, designs and forms.

## **Townscape and visual impact**

- 8.3 The proposed extension would be to the south of the property. The extension would be set back 1.5m at both ground and first floor level from the front bay of the property and the eaves and ridge line would be set down substantially from the main building, resulting in a subservient appearance which is sympathetic to the appearance of the property. The width would also be fully subordinate to the existing property, with a 0.9m distance retained to the boundary. The eaves and window detailing, along with the materials proposed, would reflect the traditional appearance of the property. Whilst the extension would sit at a higher level in the streetscene than its nearest neighbour to the south, this is the current relationship between the two properties. It is also considered this change in land levels assists in preventing a terracing effect in the streetscene, along with the fact that the side addition to no.13 is single storey providing a clear gap between the flank walls. Properties in the area tend to be large detached buildings of varying design, many of which have been extended in a number of forms. In this context and given the above factors, it is not considered the development would be out of character with the streetscene and would be an acceptable development in this respect. This is in accordance with the above mentioned policies.

## **Residential amenity**

- 8.4 The proposed extension would be 0.9m off the boundary. There is a ground floor window in the flank wall of no.13, which is on a lower land level. Representations confirm this window serves a utility room, which would not be a main habitable room, and there are glazed panels in the front door serving the room. The outlook of this window is already onto the flank wall of no.15, albeit a greater distance away. As such it is not considered a refusal of planning permission could be justified on the basis of the impact on this non-habitable window.
- 8.5 Whilst the extension would be on a higher level than the neighbouring property at no.13, as previously stated this is the situation as existing. Although the extension would reduce the separation distance, the extension is lower in height than the main building with no side windows which would result in an improved situation in privacy terms compared to the existing situation. The extension would be set back at ground and first floor level by 1.5m at the front, which along with the orientation of the two properties and the separation distance, would mean there would be no significant harm to the light or outlook of the front habitable room windows of no.13. There would be a minimal projection beyond the main rear wall of no.13, but given the separation distance there would be no material impact on the light and outlook of any habitable room windows on the rear of no.13.
- 8.6 There are no side windows proposed as part of the development, and a condition can ensure that no windows are inserted in the future. The proposed rear windows in the development, whilst closer to the boundary with no.13, would have the same relationship with the neighbouring rear garden as the existing dwelling. This relationship is an established situation for residential properties with a street layout such as this. It is considered the proposal would be acceptable in terms of residential amenity and in accordance with the relevant policies above.

## **Highways**

- 8.7 The applicant proposes a garage at ground floor level. According to maps produced by TfL, the site lies within an area with a PTAL level of 1a, indicating poor access to public transport links. Therefore the addition of a parking space is considered to be appropriate given this context and the existing parking provision on site. The applicant proposes to utilise the existing vehicular access on the other side of the building, so there will be no changes to the access arrangements in and out of the site. Changes to the frontage that may be necessary to accommodate this could be carried out under permitted development. The development is considered to be acceptable from a highways and transport perspective and in accordance with the relevant policies.

### **Conclusions**

- 8.8 It is recommended that planning permission should be granted for the proposal, as it would be acceptable in terms of townscape, the visual amenity of the area, and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.9 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.