

Agenda Item: 6.1

06/05193/P 19/12/2006 Fairfield

Application for full planning permission

Agent:	Applicant:
Allplans Ltd	Mr M Shah
"Hartley Court"	31 Upfield
Hartley Down	Croydon
Purley Surrey	Surrey
CR8 4EA	CR0 5DR

Location: 31 Upfield, Croydon, CR0 5DR

Description: Erection of single/two storey side/rear extensions and dormer extensions in rear roof slope

Drawing No(s): 12183 REV. C, 12183/1 REV. 3

Recommendation: **Refuse Permission**

Reason(s) for refusal :-

1. The development would detract from the appearance of the building and be detrimental to the amenities of the street scene by reason of dominance, siting and design and would thereby conflict with Policy UD2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan) and Supplementary Planning Document No 2 on Residential Extensions

Ward: **Fairfield**
Lead Officer: **Head of Planning Control.**

PLANNING COMMITTEE
15th March 2007

Application Number: 06/5193/P; 31 Upfield, Croydon CR0 5DR

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report concerns an application for the erection of a single/two-storey side/rear extensions and dormer extensions in rear roof slope.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That planning permission be refused for the reason set out in the agenda.
-

3. BACKGROUND

(a) Site Description

- 3.1 The site is occupied by a two storey detached residential dwelling located on the southeastern side of Upfield. To the rear of the application site is Metropolitan Green Belt. The surrounding area is residential in character, with well-separated detached houses. No. 29 Upfield has been extended in the past by the erection of a side extension on its southern side adjacent to the application premises.

(b) Relevant Planning History

- 3.2 06/2647/P - Planning permission granted to erect a single/two storey side/rear extension and dormer extensions on the rear roof slope. The proposed first floor extension was set in at 800mm from the boundary and was considered satisfactory, and not likely to have had an adverse effect on the amenities of the adjoining properties or the streetscene.

(c) Proposal

- 3.3 This is an application for the erection of a single/two storey side/rear extensions and dormer extensions in the rear roof slope.
- 3.4 One side extension at ground floor level would extend from the main house to the boundary with 29 Upfield. It would project 5.3 metres beyond the main rear building line. At first floor level, the extension would also abut the site boundary but would be set back from the front wall of the house by 2.7 metres. On the opposite side of the house a conservatory would be enlarged by 1.2 metres into the rear garden. At roof level, two pitched roof dormers would be inserted into the rear roof slope.
- 3.5 The only difference between this application and that previously approved is that the first floor extension would now abut the boundary with 29 Upfield. This involves an increase in width of 0.8 metres.

4. PLANNING POLICIES:

- 4.1 Unitary Development Plan: SP3, UD3 and UD8
Supplementary Planning Document 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations.

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 4 adjacent occupiers notified. No replies.
- 5.2 Councillor David Fitze has referred the application to Committee on grounds of the proposed design not resulting in an adverse effect on the neighbouring property at 29 Upfield.

6. CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The principal issues are-

1. Whether the proposal would comply with the land use policies of the Unitary Development Plan
2. The effects of the development on:
 - (a) The townscape of the area
 - (b) The amenities of adjoining occupiers

Townscape issues

6.2 All of the properties in Upfield are generously detached and set in to spacious plots. Views between individual properties which emphasise the low density of the locality form an important feature of the area. The proposed two-storey side extension would, unlike in the previously approved scheme, extend to the boundary line at both ground and first floor levels. Whilst the proposed 2.75 metres set back from the main front wall would ensure that the extension at first floor level remains subservient to the original house, the extension would still significantly add to the bulk on the boundary and infill part of the gap between it and its neighbour. This would not be acceptable as it is considered important to retain the visual separation between buildings in this locality.

All other design considerations have already been considered as acceptable in the previous application.

Amenities of adjoining and nearby occupiers

6.2 It is considered that the extension would not have any immediate adverse effects on the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

These have been discussed above

8. EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

None arising from this application.

Case Officer: Sera Banya

Background Documents: Referral from Councillor D. Fitze

Contact Officer: Mr P Mills, Tel: 020 8760 5419