

PART 5: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 5.3

1 APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 18/04648/FUL
 Location: 13 Tindale Close, South Croydon, CR2 0RT
 Ward: Sanderstead
 Description: Erection of single/two storey front/side/rear extensions and alterations for subdivision into a pair of semi-detached dwellings.
 Drawing Nos: J003034/DD01; J003034/DD02; J003034/DD03; J003034/DD05; J003034/DD06; J003034/DD07; J003034/DD08; J002740/DD09; Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement – prepared by Broad Oak Tree consultants Limited – Ref: J48.56 and dated 23/07/2018.
 Agent: Mr James Webzell
 Case Officer: Rachel Gardner

	Studio	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed+	Total
Existing Provision	-	-	-	1	1
Proposed Provision	-	-	-	2	2

	Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
Existing Provision	2	0
Proposed Provision	2	4

- 1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Sub-Committee because the Ward Councillor, Councillor Tim Pollard made representation in accordance with the Planning Committee Consideration Criteria and requested committee consideration.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 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 wholly in accordance with the approved plans and documents except where specified by conditions

- 2) Tree Protection measures in place prior to works beginning on the site, including storage of materials, appropriate ground protection, fencing and foundations
- 3) Construction management plan
- 4) The front facing window of bedroom 04 of the northern most dwelling shall be obscure glazed up to 1.7m from the floor in which it is installed
- 5) Materials to match the existing dwelling
- 6) New paving to be permeable
- 7) Removal of permitted development rights
- 8) Car and cycle spaces and refuse store arrangements in place prior to first occupation
- 9) To commence the development within 3 years
- 10) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

Informatives

- 1) CIL
- 2) Code of Practice on the Control of Noise and Pollution from Construction Sites
- 3) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning & Strategic Transport

2.2 That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

3.1 The applicant seeks full planning permission for the following:

- Erection of a single storey front and rear extension to existing house
- Erection of a part single, part 2-storey side extension as a separate dwelling
- Provision of cycle and refuse stores

3.2 It is noted that planning permission (ref: 17/04278/FUL) was granted for a very similar proposal by the local authority on 6th October 2017 however, it is noted that this planning permission has not been implemented. Details of this are included in the planning history section of this report.

Site and Surroundings

3.3 The application site comprises a 2-storey detached dwelling comprising 5 – bedrooms and benefits from a single storey front porch element, raised rear decking and detached double garage which is attached to the neighbours garage at No. 14.



Figure 1: View of the subject site from Tindale Close.



Figure 2: Image of the front of the existing dwellinghouse

- 3.4 The surrounding area is predominately residential in nature, with Tindale Close characterised by similar style 2-storey properties. To the north-west of the site is a flatted development. The rear of the site adjoins Purley Downs Road however, it does not address this street with the high level rear boundary fence. Purley Downs Golf Club is located on the southern side of Purley Downs Road.



Figure 3: View of the rear of the property from Purley Downs Road

- 3.5 The site is subject to a Tree Protection Order, No. 145 of 1962. Most notably there is a large Beech tree to the north-west of the application site.
- 3.6 The site is not located within a conservation area.

Planning History

The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

- 3.7 06/04079/P – Permission granted 22.11.2006

Retention of decking at the rear

- 3.7 14/04937/P – Permission refused 05.02.2015

Erection of detached 2 bedroom dwelling at side and provision of associated parking

Refused on grounds of overdevelopment, out of character with surrounding area, impact on protected trees.

Appeal dismissed on same grounds

It is noted that since this planning application was refused that there has been changes to planning policy. In addition, the subject proposal incorporates a greater setback to the western side boundary, is positioned closer to the street and is not considered to adversely impact on the protected trees.

3.8 17/00216/HSE – Permission granted 10.03.2017

Erection of two storey side extension and single storey front extension, extension to decking

3.9 17/01693/HSE – permission granted 02.06.2017

Erection of two storey side extension, single storey extension to existing porch, decking and single storey rear extension

3.10 17/04278/FUL – Permission granted by Planning Sub-Committee on 06.10.2017

Erection of single/two storey front/side/rear extensions and alterations for subdivision into a pair of 4 bedroom semi-detached dwellings

The subject proposal is very similar to this recently approved scheme. The main changes involve increasing the width of the building by 1.2 metres to the western side and reducing the depth of the proposed single storey rear extension by approximately 1.5-1.6 metres. It is also noted that the bin store has been altered to accommodate new council refuse requirements.

4 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposal is very similar to a previous application approved by Planning Committee. The scheme differs in the depth and width of the extension to form a new unit. Whilst the proposal is considered in detail below, it is not considered to have significantly different impacts than the previous consent.
- The proposed extension and new unit would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the street scene in this part of Tindale Close. It would be out of the direct line of sight when approaching this part of Tindale Close and would not be immediately visible in the wider street scene and would be partly screened, particularly at ground floor level by the existing detached garage.
- The proposed ground floor rear extension would be 2.85 metres in depth and the overall dwelling would protrude approximately 4.6 metres beyond the rear of the eastern adjoining property, No. 12. The proposed single storey rear extension has been reduced in depth by 1.5 metres from the previously approved scheme LBC Ref 17/04278/FUL, and therefore the

subject proposal would have a reduced impact on this neighbour when compared to the previously approved scheme.

- The proposed extension would be generously separated from the rear of 14 Tindale Close (by 15.5 metres) which is considered a significant enough distance to protect residential amenities. This setback to the northern adjoining property has already been accepted in principle by the local planning authority under previous planning application including LBC Ref 17/04278/FUL.
- The formation of two separate units would be acceptable given the amenities of the future occupiers. Car parking, cycle parking and details of refuse storage and collection would also be acceptable.
- The proposal would encroach very slightly into the Root Protection Area of the protected Beech tree. However screw pile foundations are proposed which would be acceptable, allowing the health of the tree to be maintained. The current proposal would have no greater impact on roots than the previously approved scheme LBC Ref 17/04278/FUL.

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 14 letters sent to adjoining occupiers of the application site.

5.2 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: 8 Objecting: 8 Support: 0

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

- Overdevelopment of the site
- Out of character with neighbouring properties
- Insufficient parking and vehicle access
- Insufficient bin storage (both on-site and at collection point)
- Obstruction to refuse and emergency vehicles (Officer Comment: The proposed development would be contained within the boundaries of the site.)
- Compromised rear access to No. 10 Tindale Close (Officer Comment: It is not clear how the proposed development would compromise the rear access to this property. The proposed development is entirely within the boundaries of the site)
- Impact on protected trees
- Loss of green space apart of a green corridor and loss of wildlife habitat
- Impact on drainage system
- Overlooking to flats within Barrads Hall and No. 14
- Loss of light to No. 14 and 15

- Increased noise and disturbance
- Impact, including noise, dust and disruption from construction works
- Inaccurate plans and discrepancy of plans with the land registry title plan - (Officer comment: See section 5.5 below)

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

- Issues with ownership over parts of the land which is communal – (Officer Comment: This is not a material planning consideration and is to be dealt with through civil action.)
- Increase pressure on sewers – [Officer Comment: The Council has no jurisdiction over the sewer system and these issues should be raised with Thames Water.]

5.4 Councillor Tim Pollard made the following representation:

- Inaccurate and misleading drawings
- Loss of privacy to neighbours
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Potential damage to protected trees.

5.5 It is noted that representations raised issue with the accuracy of the submitted plans and these matters are addressed as follows:

- The tree canopies have not been depicted correctly – (Officer Comment: The tree canopys are indicative only. A detailed arboriculture report has been submitted as part of the application which includes satisfactory details regarding size, health, type of trees on the site).
- The plan omits the boundary line between the subject site and Barrads Hall (Officer Comment: The submitted existing and proposed site plan clearly shows all site boundaries and the existing and proposed buildings and their relationship to the site boundaries.)
- Plans have shown a limited width to the driveway (Officer Comment: The measurements of the vehicle access, driveway and garages appears to be correct from officers site visit.)
- Plans have shown the subject site at ground level (The existing and proposed side elevations show the gradient of the site, including the fairly level access at the front and the rear of the property raised from the ground level.)

6 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

6.1 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 2018 (CLP) and the South London Waste Plan 2012.

6.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in July 2018. 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

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

Consolidated London Plan 2015 (LP):

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 on Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- 6.13 on Parking
- 7.2 Designing out crime
- 7.4 on Local character
- 7.6 on Architecture
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- 7.21 Trees and woodland

Croydon Local Plan 2018 (CLP 2018):

- SP2 on homes
- SP4 on urban design and local character
- SP6 on environment and climate change
- SP8 on transport and communications
- DM1 on housing choice for sustainable communities
- DM10 on design and character
- DM13 on refuse and recycling
- DM16 on promoting healthy communities
- DM19 on promoting and protecting healthy communities
- DM23 on development and construction
- DM25 on sustainable drainage systems and reducing flood risk
- DM28 on trees
- DM29 on promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion

- DM30 on car and cycle parking in new development
- DM43 Sanderstead

6.4 The relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance is as follows:

- London Housing SPG (March 2016)
- The Nationally Described Space Standards (October 2015)
- SPD2 Residential Extensions and Alterations

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the Planning Committee is required to consider are as follows:

- Principle of development;
- Townscape and visual impact;
- Residential amenity;
- Living conditions of future occupiers;
- Parking and highway safety;
- Flood risk and sustainability;
- Trees and biodiversity;
- Other planning matters

Principle of development

7.2 The appropriate use of land is a material consideration to ensure that opportunities for development are recognised and housing supply optimised. The application site currently comprises single dwellinghouse.

7.3 Planning permission has previously been granted (ref: 17/04278/FUL) by the local authority to extend the property to the side and rear and construct an additional dwellinghouse of the site, and therefore the principle of intensification of the existing residential use on the site has already been established.

7.4 Therefore, the principle of a new unit on the site is established.

Townscape and Visual Impact

7.5 The proposed 2-storey side extension would not have a set back at first floor level. Nevertheless, this is considered acceptable in this instance as it would not cause any terracing effect, identified by SPD2 as to be avoided, as there is no neighbouring occupier to this side of the property. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be in south-west corner of the cul-de-sac and due to the tight nature and layout of this area of Tindale Close, views of the extension would not be possible until one is well within the cul-de-sac. As the majority of the extension would be well screened by the existing garages to the front of the application site, the proposal would not have a dominating impact on the streetscene. This has been established as being acceptable through the previous application.

- 7.6 The proposed 2-storey side extension would be of similar design and proportions to the existing dwelling as it incorporated a pitched roof form, front porch element, matching window detailing and materials. As such, the proposed new dwelling would be sympathetic to the existing and the relatively uniform character of the streetscene. The increased width, beyond the previous approval, does not give rise to an unbalanced or overly dominant or long built form.
- 7.7 The proposed ground floor rear extension would be subordinate to the host building as it is single storey in height, incorporates matching materials and proportions and detailing which respect the host building. Whilst the proposed rear extension would protrude more than 3 metres beyond the rear of the neighbouring property, the depth of the extension has been reduced by 1.5 metres from the previously consented scheme (ref: 17/04278/FUL).
- 7.8 The submitted plans have shown a cycle and refuse store to be located at the front of the dwellings. The location of these are considered acceptable as they will not be highly visible within the street scene and they are in accessible and convenient locations. The stores appear to be modestly proportioned, robust, and covered and it is suitable that they be constructed of materials to match the existing dwelling.
- 7.9 Representations have raised concern that the proposal would result in the overdevelopment of the site. The principle of an additional dwelling and extensions of similar size has already been accepted in principle on the site under previously consented schemes. Nevertheless it is noted that the London Plan sets out indicative density ranges for sites. The desired density range for the site would be 35-55 units per hectare and the proposal presents 35 units per hectare which is within, and at the lower end of, the indicative desired density range for the site.

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenity

- 7.10 The immediately adjoining properties, including No. 12 and 14 Tindale Close and the residential flats at Barrards Hall would be most sensitive to the proposed development and the resultant impact on these properties is discussed below.

12 Tindale Close

- 7.11 A ground floor rear extension, which is 1.5 metres deeper than the proposed ground floor rear extension of the subject application has already been considered acceptable in terms of its impact on No. 12 Tindale Close. As such, the subject proposal would result in a reduced impact on this neighbour. The impact is therefore considered acceptable.
- 7.12 The proposal does not incorporate any side facing windows to this neighbouring property and therefore no loss of privacy is anticipated.

14 Tindale Close

- 7.13 The impact of a similar 2-storey side extension has previously been considered to be acceptable in planning applications 17/00216/HSE, 17/01693/HSE and 17/04278/FUL. The 2-storey side extension protrudes an additional 1.2 metres towards the western side boundary beyond the most recently approved development of planning application 17/04278/FUL. Given that the proposed extension will be separated by over 15 metres from the rear of this neighbouring property, no adverse loss of light or an overbearing appearance is anticipated to result.
- 7.14 As with previous applications, it is considered suitable to impose a condition requiring the first floor front window of bedroom 04 of the proposed new dwelling to be obscurely glazed up to 1.7 metres in height to restrict overlooking to the rear of the neighbouring property. This bedroom has a secondary window for obtaining adequate light.
- 7.15 No. 14 Tindale Close does not have any side windows facing the subject site, except for a side door which is obscurely glazed and directly behind the existing garage to that property. Therefore any impact on this would not harm the overall residential amenities of the occupiers.

Barrards Hall

- 7.16 To the west of the site is a residential flat building and the outdoor amenity space of this neighbouring property is located alongside the subject site. There would be over 15 metres between the proposed 2-storey extension and the nearest point of this residential flat building. Given this, the existing boundary fencing and dense vegetation along the shared boundary, no adverse loss of light, privacy or an overbearing appearance is anticipated to result. The only first floor side windows would be from a bedroom and bathroom and these would not overlook any private amenity spaces.
- 7.17 The proposed development is likely to generate additional comings and goings to/ from the site however, the additional noise levels associated with this is not anticipated to be beyond what would be expected within residential areas.

General

- 7.18 It is noted that during the construction phases of the development that the neighbours may be subject to additional noise and disturbance. However, these impacts are anticipated to be short term only and these matters can be controlled through environmental health legislation. Nevertheless, it is considered prudent to impose a condition requiring a construction management plan which amongst other things, should incorporate details of how impacts to neighbouring properties will be minimised during this phase of development.



Figure 4: Outline of the existing dwelling shown in orange, the previously approved extension shown in blue (ref: 17/04278/FUL) and the proposed extensions of the subject scheme.

The standard of accommodation for future occupiers

- 7.19 The proposed new dwelling would exceed the internal dimensions, minimum bedroom sizes and gross internal floor area as required by the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The existing dwelling incorporates a new bedroom which would also comply with the minimum bedroom sizes and the overall size of the existing dwelling would also comply with the NDSS requirements. It is noted that the first floor bedrooms of the existing dwelling are not required to comply with the minimum bedroom sizes of the NDSS as no changes are proposed to these.
- 7.20 Both dwellings would be dual aspect and therefore allow reasonable amount of light into the units.
- 7.21 The Housing SPG requires dwellings to have a minimum 5sq.m of private amenity space for dwellings of 1-2 people and an additional 1sq.m for each additional occupant. The two dwellings would far exceed these requirements with over 40sq.m of private amenity space provided for each dwelling. The dividing fencing between these amenity spaces is shown as a minimum 1.8 metres in height which is considered suitable to ensure that these rear amenity spaces would be private.

Parking and highways

- 7.22 The site has a PTAL rating of 0, which is considered very poor, although a relatively new bus route (Route 359) on Purley Downs Road has recently been introduced that should assist in improving this PTAL rating. Nevertheless, the scale and nature of the development is such that it is likely to have a negligible impact on the surrounding highway network. The proposal retains the 4 parking spaces on the site (two garages and space in front of each garage), however 2 tandem parking spaces are allocated to each dwelling. This is considered to be acceptable given the relatively poor public transport accessibility and the scale of the development.
- 7.23 Representations have raised concerns that there would be insufficient space on the driveway for vehicles to open their doors. However, both car parking spaces would meet the recommended standards for vehicle car parking spaces which is 4.8m (depth) and 2.4m (width).
- 7.24 Representations have also raised concerns and that the vehicle access width is insufficient for two vehicles to pass at the same time. It is considered acceptable that the future occupiers share this crossover given that vehicle movements are not anticipated to be high and there is sufficient space for two vehicles to park either side on the driveway and for one to enter/ exit the site at a time. This has previously been found acceptable.
- 7.25 The submitted plans have shown 2 cycle parking spaces to be provided for each dwelling, which complies with the London Plan requirements. Separate refuse stores have been provided for each of the dwelling within maximum pulling distances and the capacity of these stores comply with Council's new refuse storage requirements. Representations have raised concern that there is insufficient space on the road for the bins to be stored for their collection. From the case officer's site visit there appears to be ample space for the bins to be positioned on the road for their collection.

Trees and biodiversity

- 7.26 The application was submitted with a substantial Arboricultural report based on the current scheme. The report details that one Yew tree is proposed to be removed and this is considered acceptable as this is a category C tree, with minimal amenity value due to its small size and that it is heavily crowded by the Beech tree, which is inhibiting its growth.
- 7.27 The proposed extension would be within the RPA of two Beech trees however, the arboricultural report states that with specific foundation designs this will adequately avoid impact to the trees' roots. Council's tree officer raised no objection to this, subject to the protection measures listed in the report being put in place before any works commence on the site. This is secured by condition.
- 7.28 Objections have been received in relation to loss of wildlife as a result of the proposed development. The subject site is not designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance and the proposal retains a generous area which is not built upon. Therefore, officers have no concern in this regard.

Flood risk

7.29 The application site does not lie within a flood risk area. Given that the proposed building works involve an extension to the host building, generous outdoor amenity space is retained and that new hard surfacing will be secured as permeable, the proposed development is not anticipated to result in adverse impact to the surrounding drainage area.

8. Conclusions

8.1 Taking all of the above planning considerations into account, it is recommended that planning permission should be granted.

8.2 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted subject to conditions for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.