

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision**Item 6.5****1.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS**

Ref: 18/05204/FUL
 Location: Land and parking adjoining 2 The Lawns to include land to the rear of 142-148 Beauchamp Road, Upper Norwood, London, SE19 3TS.
 Ward: Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood
 Description: Erection of 3 no. 3-bed two storey houses and 1 no. 2-bed two storey house, with associated parking
 Drawing Nos: 001, 002, 201, 202, 203, 301, 302, 303 and 304
 Applicant: Mr Kazi Abdul of KKB Investments Limited
 Case Officer: James Udall

| | 2B 4P | 3 B 5P | Total |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Existing Provision | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed Provision | 1 | 3 | 4 |

| Number of car parking spaces | Number of cycle parking spaces |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | 8 |

- 1.1 This application is being reported to 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. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and reports except where specified by conditions
2. Submission and approval of details of materials.
3. Details to be supplied for: Refuse/Cycles/Boundary/Floor levels/lighting /green roofs.
4. Details of car parking
5. Submission and approval of details of hard and soft landscaping (including green roofs)
6. 19% reduction in CO2 Emissions
7. 110l Water Restriction
8. Submission and approval of details of visibility splays
9. Submission and approval of details of a Construction Logistics Plan

10. Units to be M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable
11. Time limit of 3 years
12. Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

Informatives

- 1) CIL
- 2) Code of construction practise for Construction Sites
- 3) Samples of window frames, brick and permeable paving would need to be submitted for Condition 2.
- 4) Any other informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

3.0 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 The proposal includes the following:

- Erection of 3 no. 3-bed two storey houses and 1 no. 2-bed two storey house
- Provision of 2 off-street car parking spaces (accessed from The Lawns).
- Provision of associated refuse/cycle stores

Site and Surroundings

- 3.2 The application site is a disused pieced of land to the south of The Lawns and to the north of Beauchamp Road, which was formerly used as a small council operated car park. It also includes an area to the rear of properties in Beauchamp Road formerly used as garden area. The car park has since been sold by the Council and is now vacant with a hoarding around it.
- 3.3 Properties along Beauchamp Road and The Lawns, in close proximity to the site are single family dwelling-houses, generally two storeys in height and predominantly terraced.

Planning History

3.4 None relevant.

4.0 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed development would create good quality residential accommodation that would make a positive contribution to the borough's housing stock and would make a small contribution to the Council achieving its housing targets as set out in the London Plan (2016) and Croydon Local Plan (2018). The proposed development provides an appropriate mix of units.
- The proposed development would be of an appropriate mass, scale, form and design that would be in keeping with its context, thus preserving the appearance of the site and surrounding area.
- The proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.
- The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the operation of the highway.

- Subject to conditions, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the extent of flood risk.
- Sustainability aspects can be controlled by conditions.

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 40 letters of notification to neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the application site. A site notice was also displayed at the site. The number of representations received from neighbours, MPs, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application are as follows:

No of individual responses: 13 Objecting: 13 Supporting: 0

- 5.2 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:

| Summary of objections | Response |
|--|--|
| <i>Parking Issues</i> | |
| Council parking for approximately 15 cars has been bought for this project. In its place, the erection of dwellings for a minimum of 4 families | Please see Paragraphs 7.34 – 7.36 |
| Parking/Highways | Please see Paragraphs 7.34 – 7.36 |
| <i>Scale/appearance of development</i> | |
| Overdevelopment | Please see Paragraphs 7.5 – 7.6 |
| Out of character for the area | Please see Paragraphs 7.8 – 7.15 |
| The north of the borough is already densely populated and the proposals will add to that density | Please see Paragraphs 7.4 – 7.6 |
| Gardens would be too small | Please see Paragraphs 7.10 and 7.32 |
| How will the materials be controlled | Materials can be controlled by the imposition of a planning condition |
| The number of houses should be reduced | Please see Paragraphs 7.5 – 7.6 |
| Obtrusive by design | Please see Paragraphs 7.15 |
| <i>Neighbour amenity</i> | |
| Overlooking | Please see Paragraphs 7.18 – 7.22, 7.23 – 7.25 and 7.27 – 7.29 |
| Loss of light | Please see Paragraphs 7.18 – 7.30 |
| Loss of privacy | Please see Paragraphs 7.18 – 7.22, 7.23 – 7.25 and 7.27 – 7.29 |
| Noise | |
| Detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring properties | Please see Paragraphs 7.18 – 7.30 |
| Impact on pollution (noise, light, disturbance etc) | Please see Paragraph 7.39 |
| <i>Affordable Housing</i> | |
| The proposed development will not have any affordable homes to rent or starter homes to buy. The current proposal is to sell the new build at market value - this is | The proposal falls below the threshold (of 10 or more units), above which an element of affordable housing is required. Therefore, in this case, |

| | |
|---|--|
| not contributing to meeting the strategic objectives of the Homes section of the Croydon Local Plan 2018. | there is no policy requirement for affordable housing. |
| <i>Safety and Security</i> | |
| The proposal would include a public access road which would compromise the security of neighbouring houses and encourage crime and anti-social behaviour | Please see Paragraph 7.16 |
| <i>Biodiversity</i> | |
| The proposal development will adversely impact on the local environment (lack of open and green space for wildlife) and put more strain on the surrounding sewage system | Please see Paragraph 7.39 |
| <i>Non-material issues</i> | |
| Councillors are not responding to queries | This is not a material planning consideration |
| Increasing pressure on local services | This is not a material planning consideration |
| <i>Procedural issues</i> | |
| Lack of extensive consultation | The application has been publicised by way of 40 letters of notification to neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the application site. A site notice was also displayed at the site. |
| Who would be responsible for the walkway? | The access to the application site would be the responsibility of the landowner while the pavement outside the application site would be the responsibility to of Croydon Council. |

6.0 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 New Croydon Local Plan (February 2018), 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:
- Promoting sustainable transport;
 - Promoting social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs
 - Requiring good design.

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

6.4 Consolidated London Plan 2015

- 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- 3.8 Housing choice
- 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.7 Renewable energy
- 5.10 Urban greening
- 5.12 Flood risk management
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.16 Waste net self sufficiency
- 5.18 Construction, Demolition and excavation waste
- 6.3 Effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.10 Walking
- 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- 6.12 Road Network Capacity
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.6 Architecture
- 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

6.5 Croydon Local Plan (adopted February 2018)

- SP2 – Homes
- DM1 – Housing choice for sustainable communities
- SP4 – Urban Design and Local Character
- DM10 – Design and character
- DM13 – Refuse and recycling
- SP6 – Environment and Climate Change
- DM23 – Development and construction
- DM24 – Land contamination
- DM25 – Sustainable drainage systems and reducing flood risk
- SP7 – Green Grid
- DM27 – Biodiversity
- DM28 – Trees
- SP8 – Transport and Communications
- DM29 – Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM30 – Car and cycle parking in new development
- DM39 – Crystal and Upper Norwood

6.6 There is relevant additional Planning Guidance as follows:

- Mayor of London Housing SPG, March 2016
- National Technical Housing Standards, 2015
- National Planning Practice Guidance, 2014

7.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The principal issues of this particular application relate to:

- a) The principle of the development;
- b) Impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
- c) Impact on residential amenities;
- d) Standard of accommodation;
- e) Highways impacts;
- f) Sustainability issues; and
- g) Other matters

The Principle of Development

- 7.2 The application is proposing residential development in the suburban area. There are no Local Plan designations on the site that would prevent residential development on the site. The site has been previously used for car parking on part of the site and the other part of the site is vacant land that was previously garden land. Therefore the use of the land for residential purposes is acceptable in principle, subject to detailed considerations.
- 7.3 The Local Plan identifies Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood as an area of sustainable growth with some opportunity for windfall sites and limited infilling; growth will mainly be of infilling with dispersed integration of new homes that respect existing residential character and local distinctiveness. This supports the accepted principle of the site for residential purposes
- 7.4 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposal would add increased density to an already over populated part of the borough. Both the London Plan and the NPPF place significant weight on housing delivery and focus on the roles that intensification and small sites in particular will play in resolving the current housing crisis. The Croydon Local Plan 2018 further identifies that a third of housing should come from windfall sites and suburban intensification, in order to protect areas such as Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 7.5 In respect to the density of the scheme representations have raised concern over the intensification of the site and overdevelopment. The site is a suburban setting with a PTAL rating of 2 and as such the London Plan indicates that the density levels ranges of 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) would be acceptable. The proposal would just be in excess of this range at 251 hr/ha. However, the London Plan further indicates that it is not appropriate to apply these ranges mechanistically, as the density ranges are broad, to enable account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential – such as local context, design and transport capacity. These considerations have been satisfactorily addressed (as discussed further in the sections below) and the London Plan provides sufficient flexibility for such higher density schemes to be supported.

- 7.6 Furthermore, it is relevant that the new draft London Plan removes reference to the density matrix, focussing on intensification of the suburbs as a means to achieve additional housing numbers. This document is currently being considered in the Examination in Public and will gain more weight as it nears adoption. Given that Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood has been identified as an area where additional development can take place, the proposal would accord with the policy aims.
- 7.7 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposal would not have any affordable or social rented housing. The requirement to deliver affordable housing is triggered on major development sites only (i.e. those that contain 10 or more units) and Officers are satisfied that the number of units proposed for this site is of an appropriate density. Therefore, in this case there is no requirement for an element of affordable housing.

The Character of the Area and Visual Amenities of the Street-scene

- 7.8 The application scheme proposes two storey dwellings with flat roofs which would be lower in height than the existing dwellings in the surrounding area, which, whilst two storey in height, are taller than the proposed dwellings due to their dual pitch roofs. The proposed dwellings would be appropriate in terms of bulk and mass.
- 7.9 The development employs a well-considered palette of materials and a variety of detailing that exemplifies a 'contemporary reinterpretation' approach with green roofs which is supported. The overall rhythm and generous sizes of the fenestration are complimented by an appropriate and considered choice in framing colour and materials.
- 7.10 The layout of the application site provides good sized gardens for the houses which helps soften the appearance of the development. The proposed planting bed at the front of each house would also help soften the appearance of each dwelling.



- 7.11 The proposed dwellings would be sited approximately 5.2m from the shared flank boundary with No.2 The Lawns. There are no windows in the flank of this property. The built form of the proposed dwellings would be sited between 18.65m and 27.5m

from the built form of the neighbouring dwellings in Spa Hill due to the angle of the plot. The built form of the proposed development would be sited approximately 15.6m at its closest point, from the rear building line of the dwellings in Beauchamp Road.

- 7.12 The separation distances between the proposed development and the surrounding existing properties is considered to provide sufficient spacing and would not appear cramped. The proposed layout of the development is appropriate and would not appear out of character when viewed from the surrounding area.
- 7.13 The proposed dwellings would be dual aspect which would maximise light. The, entrance and approach from the public realm is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.14 The frontage of the site would be given over to hard-standing to allow for two off street car parking spaces for the new dwellings. The siting and alignment of these spaces is considered to be acceptable and is a feature that is found in the locality. Landscaping is proposed behind the car parking spaces and this is an acceptable feature.





- 7.15 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area due to over development and that its design would appear obtrusive. Whilst the proposal would introduce a different form of development to the site in comparison to the immediate locality and an increase in built form, it is considered that the design and layout would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The scheme has been design to effectively economise the available space, provides landscaping and other green features and utilises a vacant site for housing provision. The proposal is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.16 Concerns have also been raised by neighbouring occupiers that the proposed access road would compromise the security of the existing houses. However, it is noted that the site was previously used as a car park and would have been publicly accessible with limited visual surveillance. The scheme would result in dwellings serving the access which would provide natural surveillance and therefore assist with the security of neighbouring properties. No objection is therefore raised in this instance.
- 7.17 Whilst the appearance of the development from the street scene is acceptable, detailed specification and samples of external materials would need to be secured by planning condition, alongside details of hard landscape materials including car parking and forecourt paving to ensure that the detailed design is acceptable. Having considered all of the above, against the backdrop of housing need, the proposed development would comply with the objectives of the above policies in terms of respecting local character.

The Amenities of Neighbouring Occupiers

No.2 to No.5 The Lawns

- 7.18 The proposed pedestrian and emergency access would run along the shared flank boundary with No.2 The Lawns. It is noted that 2 The Lawns does not have any flank windows which would overlook the access and given that the proposed access would only be for 4 houses, with vehicles restricted to the front of the site, it is considered that the access would have a very limited impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupants.
- 7.19 The front windows of the proposed dwellings would face onto the shared boundary with 2 The Lawns. The windows of House 1 would be sited approximately 5.7m from the shared boundary with No.2 The Lawns and would face onto a blank facade. Due to the siting of the windows, the separation distance retained and the fact that they would face onto a blank wall, the proposed windows would not ham privacy of neighbouring occupants.

- 7.20 At their closest distance to the boundary the proposed windows of House 2 would be sited approximately 6.45m from the shared boundary with No.2 increasing to a distance of 7.8m due to the angle of the plot and the orientation of the buildings. The windows would also look at the rear gardens of No.3 and No.5 but there would be a significant separation distance between the windows and the rear gardens of these dwellings.
- 7.21 Whilst there would be a degree of overlooking – across rear gardens, this is not uncommon in a suburban situation. Given the design, layout and separation between the properties the current boundary treatment and provision of a suitable landscaping scheme (secured by way of a planning condition) this is deemed acceptable to ensure no undue impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 7.22 Due to the separation distances retained the siting, design and scale of the proposed development would not harm the daylight of neighbouring occupants.

No. 73 to No.81 Spa Hill

- 7.23 In terms of impacts on the properties in Spa Hill, the windows of House 1 would be sited approximately 2.9m from the shared boundary of No.73 and 18.65m from the built form of No.73. The windows of House 2 would be sited approximately 2.6m from the shared boundary of No.75 increasing to a distance of 3.8m due to the orientation of the building. The windows would also be sited approximately 20m from the built form of No.75. This distance is sufficient to prevent window to window overlooking.
- 7.24 The windows of House 3 would be sited approximately 3.8m from the shared boundary of No.77 increasing to a distance of 4.9m due to the orientation of the plot. The windows of House 3 would be sited approximately 22m from the built form of No.77. The windows of House 4 would be sited approximately 5.1m from the shared boundary of No.81 increasing to a distance of 6.3m due to the orientation of the plot. The windows of House 4 would be sited approximately 25m from the built form of No.79 and approximately 26m from the rear building line of No.81. This distance is sufficient to prevent window to window overlooking.
- 7.25 Due to the separation distances retained between the dwellings the proposed properties would not harm the privacy of the neighbouring dwellings. There would be some limited overlooking to the rear most part of the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. However, this is not uncommon in a suburban situation and subject to the provision of a suitable landscaping scheme (secured by way of a planning condition) this is deemed acceptable to ensure no undue impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 7.26 Due to the separation distances retained the siting, design and scale of the proposed development would not harm the daylight of neighbouring occupants in Spa Hill.

No. 132 to No.153 Beauchamp Road

- 7.27 The southern elevation of the application building would be sited approximately 1.9m from the shared boundary with No.146 increasing to a distance of 2m at the boundary with No.144. Unit 4 would be sited approximately 15.65m from the built

form of the dwelling if Beauchamp Road. Unit 4 would have one ground floor window in the elevation facing the rear gardens in Beauchamp Road. Due to the separation distances retained the proposed window would not harm the privacy of neighbouring occupants.

- 7.28 The front windows of the Unit 2 would be sited approximately 3.2m from the shared boundary with No.140 while the front windows of Unit 4 would be sited approximately 3.4m from the shared boundary with No.140. Given the separation between these properties and the proposed landscaped boundary to be conditioned between these properties, this relationship is acceptable.
- 7.29 In regard to noise and disturbance the proposed development is only for 4 additional houses, with motor vehicles restricted to the front part of the site. It is therefore considered that the development would not result in undue noise, light or air pollution as a result of an increased number of occupants.
- 7.30 Due to the separation distances retained the siting, design and scale of the proposed development would not harm the daylight of neighbouring occupants in Beauchamp Road.

The Amenities of Future Occupiers

- 7.31 The Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) provide minimum technical space standards for new dwellings in terms of the internal amenity space. All of the proposed units meet the minimum required internal space standard.
- 7.32 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposed gardens are too small. With regard to external amenity space, Policy DM10.4 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 states that two bedroom dwellings should have amenity space of between 6sqm and 7sqm while three bedroom houses should have at minimum of between 7sqm and 9sqm. The proposed gardens to the dwellings are well in excess of these minimum requirements and comply with Policy DM10.4m (28sqm – 60sqm).
- 7.33 There is level access to the site from the front allowing the houses to be accessible. This arrangement can be secured by a planning condition

Traffic and Highway Safety Implications

- 7.34 The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of the site is 2 which means that the site has poor access to public transport. The scheme seeks to provide 2 off street car parking bays. In Outer London Suburban areas with PTALs between 2-4 development should provide up to 1.5 spaces per unit (i.e. a maximum), although residential parking standards should be applied flexibly. It is also noted that the Draft London Plan states that within areas of a PTAL rating 2 should have a maximum parking provision of up to 1 space per unit.
- 7.35 The proposed scheme would be below the maximum standards of the London Plan in this location. However, these standards are maximum levels only and Officers are satisfied that this level of off street car parking should help in the promotion of more sustainable travel which is supported.

- 7.36 It is noted that the Transportation Team originally raised concerns as to the level of parking proposed. However, although the site was previously used as a car park and was previously owned by the Council, the site has since been sold and since the sale has taken place, has been unavailable for public parking. Since the application has been submitted, the applicant has carried out a Car Parking Stress Survey which has showed that there is capacity for some car parking provision to be met on the neighbouring roads. The Transportation Team have since removed their objections on the basis of the results of the Car Parking Stress Survey.
- 7.37 Cycle storage facilities would need to comply with the London Plan (requiring 8 spaces), and Officers are satisfied that there is capacity within the site to accommodate the required number and this can be secured through the imposition of a planning condition. The provision of refuse storage has been shown on the plans and the location and size has been found acceptable. A Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management Plan) will be needed by LPA before commencement of work and this can be secured through a planning condition.

Sustainability Issues

- 7.38 Planning conditions can be attached to ensure that a 19% reduction in CO2 emissions over 2013 Building Regulations is achieved and mains water consumption would meet a target of 110 litres or less per head per day.
- 7.39 Concerns have been raised by neighbouring occupants that the proposal would affect the local environment. It is noted that the application site is not in a protected area and consists of a car park and a former rear garden area which would have limited environmental potential. Notwithstanding this, the proposed dwellings in the scheme would have a green roof and landscaped areas around them which would help increase biodiversity in the area. A landscaping scheme to encourage biodiversity is also proposed to be secured by planning condition. On balance it is considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the environment as to warrant recommending that planning permission be refused.

Other Matters

- 7.40 The site is not located in any designated flood area. Given that the part of the site is given over to areas of hardstanding to be utilised as parking areas, a permeable paving system should be incorporated as part of the scheme. The existing car parking area of the site, which has a hard surface would be broken up. Its replacement with permeable paving and green roofs is acceptable. Materials can be secured through a planning condition.
- 7.41 Representations have raised concern that construction works will be disruptive. As such it would be prudent to control details of construction through the requirement of a Construction Logistics Plan.
- 7.42 Representations have raised concerns that local schools and other services will be unable to cope with additional families moving into the area. The development will be liable for a charge under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This payment will contribute to delivering infrastructure to support the development of the area, which includes education provision.

7.43 Concerns were also raised by neighbour occupants that the proposal would put strain on the local sewage network. This is not a material planning consideration given the scale of development and would be a matter for Thames Water. Therefore it would not be justified to recommend that planning permission be refused on this basis.

Conclusions

7.41 The principle of development is considered acceptable within this area. The design of the scheme is of an acceptable standard and subject to the provision of suitable conditions the scheme is acceptable in relation to residential amenity, transport and sustainable matters. Thus the proposal is considered in general accordance with the relevant policies.

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