



PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.1

1.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: [17/02795/FUL \(Link to associated documents on Planning Register\)](#)
 Location: 29 Russell Hill, Purley, CR8 2JB
 Ward: Purley
 Description: Alterations; erection of single/two storey rear extension, dormer extensions in front and rear elevations and conversion to form 5x two bedroom and 4x one bedroom flats; Provision of associated parking, cycle and refuse stores
 Drawing Nos: 1427-PL-01A A, 1427-PL-02A A, 1427-PL-03A A 1427-PL-04A A, 1427-PL-05A A, 1427-PL-06A A, 1427-PL-07B A, 1427-PL-08B A, 1427-PL-09B A, 1427-PL-10A A, 1427-PL-011D A, 1427-EL-01A A, 1427-EL-02A A, 1427-EL-03A A, 1427-EL-04A A
 Applicant: Mr Ashish Chadha
 Agent: Gianfranco Cipolla
 Case Officer: Georgina Betts

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Flats		5		

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
4	18

1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee because objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Planning 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 informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

- 1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (as numbered above)
- 2. Details of cycle storage, refuse and recycling Stores, all boundary treatment, visibility splays, boundary treatment (including garden demarcation), hard and soft landscaping (to incorporate SuDS), parking management plan and disabled parking bay to be submitted to and approved prior to occupation.
- 3. Materials to match the existing
- 4. Existing vehicular access to be closed prior to occupation
- 5. Provision of at least 2 water butts
- 6. Submission of Construction Logistic Plan/Method Statement
- 7. Development shall commence within 3 years of this permission
- 8. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

Informatives

- 1) Site notice removal
- 2) Community Infrastructure Levy
- 3) Code of practise for construction sites
- 4) Any [other] informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

3.0 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

3.1 The applicant seeks outline planning permission for the following:

- Alterations and retention of existing medical treatment room
- Erection of a single/two storey rear extension
- Construction of dormer extensions in front and rear roof slopes
- Conversion to form 5x2 bedroom and 4x1 bedroom flats
- Provision of 4 car parking spaces within the front garden area
- Provision of 18 cycle spaces and refuse stores
- Associated hard and soft landscaping

Site and Surroundings

- 3.2 The application site lies on the western side of Russell Hill and is currently occupied by a large two storey detached property with one room on the ground floor being used as a medical treatment room [LBC Ref: 14/00612/P]
- 3.3 The land levels are fairly flat to the eastern side of the site and falls to the west with stepped access down to the rear garden from the existing property.
- 3.4 The area is residential in character and is made up of detached houses and bungalows set in generous landscaped plots all varying in design. New build flatted developments lie further south with examples of conversion schemes nearby. Whilst the site has a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Rating) rating of 1a, Footpath 106 lies to the south within a short walk from site leading onto an area with very good links to public transport.
- 3.5 There are no direct policy constraints that affect the site as identified in the Croydon Local Plan Proposal Map. The application site lies within an area at risk of surface water and critical drainage flooding.

Planning History

- 3.6 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:
- 3.7 00/02173/P – Erection of two storey side/front/rear extension to include garage **[Approved and Implemented]**
- 3.8 03/04097/P – Erection of dormer extension in front roof slope and velux windows in rear roof slope **[Approved and Implemented]**
- 3.9 04/03682/P – Retention of front boundary wall, railings and gates **[Approved and Implemented]**

- 3.10 07/01955/P – Use of part of ground floor as medical treatment room on Saturday morning **[Approved and Implemented]**
- 3.11 14/00612/P – Continued use of part of ground floor as medical treatment room (without compliance with Condition 1 – restriction on the days and hours that it can be used – attached to planning permission 07/01955/P) **[Approved and Implemented]**

4.0 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The principle of the development is acceptable given the residential character of this part of Purley.
- The design and appearance of the extensions are appropriate given the context of surrounding area.
- The living conditions of adjoining occupiers would be protected from undue harm
- The living standards of future occupiers are satisfactory and meet the National Housing Space Standards
- The parking provision is adequate to serve the development and the highway impact on Russell Hill is considered acceptable – with spare car parking capacity on street to accommodate the development
- Flooding aspects can be controlled by condition

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

6.0 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: 32 Objecting: 16 Supporting: 16

- 6.2 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:

Objections:

- Inadequate parking provision/cycle provision
- Over intensification of the site
- Out of character
- Loss of light/privacy and visual intrusion
- Detrimental to highway safety
- Impact on local health due to increase in cars
- Increase in vermin
- General noise and disturbance
- Increased pressure on drains and sewage network

Support:

- Good location with well-established premises
- Professional Transport Assessment supports parking provision
- Enabling first time buyers to get onto the property ladder
- Provision of much needed housing

6.3 Councillor Donald Speakman [Local Ward Councillor] has made the following representations:

- Over-intensive development.
- Extremely out of character with immediate neighbourhood.
- On-site car parking inadequate - 4 bays for 9 flats. This site is some distance from town centre and public transport

7.0 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.

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:

- Promoting sustainable transport;
- Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes;
- Requiring good design.

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

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.12 Flood risk management
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.16 Waste net self sufficiency
- 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity

- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.21 Woodlands and trees

7.4 Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (CLP1):

- SP1.1 Sustainable development
- SP1.2 Place making
- SP2.1 Homes
- SP2.2 Quantities and location
- SP2.6 Quality and standards
- SP4.1 and SP4.2 Urban design and local character
- SP4.11 regarding character
- SP5.3 Healthy and liveable neighbourhoods
- SP6.1 Environment and climate change
- SP6.2 Energy and carbon dioxide reduction
- SP6.3 Sustainable design and construction
- SP6.4 Flooding, urban blue corridors and water management
- SP8.6 and SP8.7 Sustainable travel choice
- SP8.12 Motor vehicle transportation
- SP8.17 Parking

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

- UD2 Layout and siting of new development
- UD3 Scale and design of new buildings
- UD6 Safety and security
- UD7 Inclusive design
- UD8 Protecting residential amenity
- UD13 Parking design and layout
- UD14 Landscape design
- UD15 Refuse and recycling storage
- NC4 Woodlands, trees and hedgerows
- CS2 Community Use
- T2 Traffic generation from development
- T4 Cycling
- T8 parking
- H2 Supply of new housing

7.6 There is relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance as follows:

- London Housing SPG March 2016

7.7 The Partial Review of Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (CLP1.1) and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (CLP2) have been approved by Full Council on 5 December 2016 and was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on

behalf of the Secretary of State on 3 February 2017. The examination took place between 18th May and 31st May 2017. Policies which have not been objected to can be given some weight in the decision making process. However at this stage in the process no policies are considered to outweigh the adopted policies listed here to the extent that they would lead to a different recommendation.

8.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- Principle of development
- Townscape and visual impact
- Housing Quality for future occupiers
- Residential amenity for neighbours
- Transport
- Sustainability

Principle of development

8.2 The appropriate use of land is a material consideration to ensure that opportunities for development is recognised and housing supply optimised. Given that the site is located within a residential area, the principle of a residential conversion can be supported providing that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area and there are no other impact issues. It should also be noted that the existing medical treatment centre would be retained as part of the development and as such the existing community use would be retained on site.

Townscape and visual impact.

8.3 A single/two storey rear extension is proposed which would include a barn hip roof extension with front and rear dormer windows. The application property is of an individual design and is of an extensive size with varying gable end and hipped roof forms. The provision of a barn hip roof extension would not harm the design integrity of the existing property nor the varied character of the surrounding area.

8.4 The provision of a further front dormer extension, be it of a subservient design and size, would not result in justifiable harm to street scene, given examples on the application site and in neighbouring properties. The proposed front dormer would be modest in size and would not dominate the front roof slope. The rear dormer extensions would be again modest in size and would sit comfortably within the roof space.

8.5 While the two storey rear extension would inevitably increase the overall footprint of the building, it would not extend any further than the northern flank wall of 27 Russell Hill, thus respecting the extent of neighbouring built form. The two storey extension would be seen in the backdrop of the existing property utilising matching materials such as rough cast render and timber detailing. Given its limited visibility such an extension is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

- 8.6 While it noted that representation have raised issues around the overdevelopment of the site the proposal sits comfortably within its plot, this is evident from the design of the proposal and as such, would not appear contrived or cramped. It is therefore considered that the development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Housing quality for future occupiers

- 8.7 All units would comply with internal dimensions required by the Nationally Prescribed Space Standards and would provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation.
- 8.8 Each dwelling would have a good level of outlook with access to either private amenity space or a communal garden.
- 8.9 The development would provide for high quality development for future occupiers and is considered acceptable.

Residential amenity for neighbours

- 8.10 As highlighted above, the two storey rear extension would not extend beyond the west elevations to 27 Russell Hill or 31 Russell Hill. The extension would also be well spaced from the neighbouring properties within Pringle Gardens and as such would not appear visually intrusive.
- 8.11 No sole habitable room windows would be installed in either flank walls of 29 Russell Hill whilst those specified would be obscurely glazed and would serve bathroom and en-suites. The outlook from the new dormer windows in both the front and rear elevations would not gain any unfair advantage over neighbouring properties given varying degrees of mutual overlooking. The proposed development is therefore not considered to result in a loss of privacy.
- 8.12 Given the sensitive siting of the extension, the development would not lead to an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring occupiers. Whilst it is acknowledged that some concerns have been raised (specific to 27 Russell Hill) the kitchen window at ground floor is already impacted by the existing boundary treatment to a certain extent. Similarly, the application site is due north of this property (which should limit any impacts to daylight rather than sunlight) and some enclosure and outlook reductions should be expected to side windows.
- 8.13 Concerns have been expressed by neighbouring properties that the intensification of the site would result in an unacceptable degree of noise and general disturbance. The property is already substantially sized and has the clear capacity to provide for a larger number of smaller units of accommodation, thereby contributing to borough wide housing targets. It is proposed to retain existing boundary fencing and officers are satisfied that the proposed development would have limited impact if any, in terms of noise and general disturbance.

Transport

- 8.14 The applicant has provided a Transport Assessment (TA) to support the level of on-site parking while demonstrating that existing parking stress levels are not saturated, especially at peak times given the proximity to nearby schools.

- 8.15 The applicant proposes 4 on-site parking spaces and 18 cycle spaces. While it is acknowledged that the parking provision falls below the maximum parking standards set out in the Croydon Plan, consideration must be given to the physical connectivity of the site, the need to encourage sustainable transport modes and existing parking stress levels.
- 8.16 As the TA concludes, the site is within reasonable walking distance to various bus routes with Purley Station hosting excellent cycle parking provision regardless of the site's low PTAL rating (1a). Whilst parking stress levels peak on Russell Hill between 3pm and 3:15pm (56.70%) which is relatively manageable, the can be attributed to nearby schools and associated dropping off. Parking stress levels fall dramatically after 3:45pm which is when on street car parking is more likely to be demanded by residents of the street (including future residents of these proposals). Similar patterns are experienced in the morning, with stress levels at 44.33% between 8:30 and 8:45am and dropping dramatically after 9.30am. The applicant has therefore demonstrated that the potential overspill of 5 cars onto the highway network would not result in saturated parking levels at peak times or indeed any other times and could be accommodated on site without significant harm to the safety or convenience of other highway users.
- 8.17 Parking is restricted at the curved junction of Russell Hill by the placement of double yellow lines. Due to the nature of the road, vehicles tend to approach the bend at slower speeds, with the bend acting as a natural speed calming measure. It is therefore considered that the additional on street parking would not prejudice highway safety or efficiency given the site specifics.
- 8.18 While the TA excludes the medical treatment centre from the anticipated trip level data, the LPA have referred back to the details within application 14/00612/P. This application advised that all parking would be accommodated within the existing forecourt. As the proposal seeks to retain this use and with the overall lack of information around how the forecourt may be managed as part of this mixed use scenario, it is recommended that a condition requiring a parking management strategy to be approved by the LPA is considered necessary.
- 8.19 It is acknowledged that this arrangement may displace further cars onto Russell Hill but given the opening hours of the medical treatment centre and low levels of car parking stress highlighted above, this would be unlikely to lead to an unacceptable overspill. For the reasons given above the development is considered acceptable on highway grounds subject to the condition set out in the agenda.

Sustainability

- 8.20 The site lies within a surface water and critical drainage flood risk area as identified by the Croydon flooding maps. Hard and soft landscaping details would be secured through condition and it suggested that such proposals incorporate SuDS where appropriate. Officers are satisfied that such issues can be dealt through a relevant condition.

Other Planning Issues

- 8.21 Representations have raised concerns in respect of impact upon local infrastructure such as sewers and drains although no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would prejudice the existing sewage or drain network. There is a

requirement on utility services to make necessary provisions outside the planning process.

8.22 While the area lies with an area with a low PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) this does not mean that the proposal is an unsustainable form of development.

Conclusions

8.23 The proposal would result in the redevelopment of the site which would provide 8 additional homes in the borough. The development would be in keeping with the character of the area and would not have a significant impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. Landscaping, parking and sustainable drainage are all acceptable in principle and can be controlled by condition.

8.24 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.