

05/04475/P

17/10/2005

Coulsdon West

Application for full planning permission

Applicant:

J P Whelan Homes Limited

Norheads House

Glovers Close

Biggin Hill Kent

TN16 3GA

Location: Hydon Cottage, Hollymeoak Road, Coulsdon, CR5 3QA

Description: Demolition of existing building; erection of 3 detached five bedroom houses with integral double garages; formation of vehicular accesses onto Starrock Road and Hollymeoak Road

Drawing No(s): WS233-10, WS233-9, WS233-7, WS233-8

Recommendation: **Grant Permission**

Subject to the following condition(s) and reason(s):-

1. No works on site shall commence until details of the external facing materials have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory in accordance with Policies BE1 and BE13 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD2 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

2. The approval of the Local Planning Authority shall be obtained with respect to the following matters before the development is begun:-
Section A

(1) sight lines for Starrock Road

(2) visibility splays for Starrock Road

Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of development having regard to the policies of the Unitary Development Plan and of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

3. Unless otherwise previously agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing the matters approved in compliance with Condition 2 shall be provided before any part of the development is occupied and shall also be retained for so long as the development remains in existence

Reason: To ensure that an acceptable standard of development is provided and retained

4. Unless otherwise previously agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing the following shall be provided as specified in the application before any part of the

development is occupied:

(1) finished floor levels of the buildings in relation to existing and proposed site levels

(2) boundary fences

Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of development having regard to the Policies of the Unitary Development Plan and of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

5. The existing planting shall not be felled, lopped, topped or otherwise removed during the course of development or within five years after completion, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority; any planting which is removed without consent, or dies or is severely damaged or becomes seriously diseased before the end of that period shall be replaced with planting of such size and species as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority; this condition shall not be construed as overriding the requirements to obtain consent under any Tree Preservation Order or the legislation concerning trees in Conservation Areas

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD13 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

6. Prior to the commencement of works on site including those for demolition, drainage and foundations, a scheme shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority specifying the means by which those trees to be retained shall be protected during the works. The approved scheme shall be implemented on site prior to commencement and retained for the duration of the works.

Reason: To ensure the survival of the existing trees that contribute to the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD13 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

7. No structures, vehicles, plant, machinery, equipment, materials or spoil shall be positioned or stored within 5 metres of the trunk of any tree to be retained and no cement, oil or tar, bitumen or other similar material shall be stored within 10 metres thereof without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure that the trees to be retained are not damaged by the construction and associated works in accordance with Policy BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD13 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

8. No service trench or pipeline shall be located within 5 metres of the trunk of any tree to be retained without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure that the trees to be retained are not damaged by the construction and associated works in accordance with Policy BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD13 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

9. A landscaping scheme to include existing and proposed planting shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before the development is

begun; when approved, the planting shall be provided before any part of the development is occupied or within such longer period or periods as the Local Planning Authority may previously agree in writing and shall be maintained for a period of five years from the date of planting; any planting which dies or is severely damaged or becomes seriously diseased or is removed within that period shall be replaced by planting of similar size and species to that originally provided

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development, protect the visual amenities of the locality, and to ensure that the new planting becomes established in accordance with Policy BE14 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD13 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

10. Notwithstanding anything contained in Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any amendment or replacement therefore, no enlargement of any dwelling (including the erection or enlargement of a garage or any other building or enclosure within the curtilage of any dwelling) shall be carried out without the express permission of the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and the visual character of the area and wooded hillsides in accordance with Policies BE1 and BE17 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies UD2, UD6 and UD7 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

11. No window or glazed door shall be provided in the eastern or western elevations of house plot 3 (Holyme oak Road) at or above first floor level other than as specified in the application.

Reason: To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy BE17 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy UD6 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

12. No window or glazed door shall be provided in the eastern or western elevations of house plot 1 or plot 2 at or above ground floor level other than as specified in the application.

Reason: To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy BE17 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note No.2 on Residential Extensions and Policy UD6 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

13. The windows in the eastern and western elevations of plot 1, plot 2 and plot 3 shall be retained in the form specified in the application for so long as the development remains in existence.

Reason: To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy BE17 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note No.2 on Residential Extensions and Policy UD6 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

14. A site investigation and assessment into the possibility of soil contamination shall be carried out to the approval of the Local Planning Authority before the development is begun and except with the prior written agreement of the Local

Planning Authority, any remedial measures identified in the assessment shall be carried out to the approval of the Local Planning Authority before the development is begun

Reason: To ensure the safe development of potentially contaminated land in accordance with Policy EP8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy EP9 of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan)

15. The development shall be begun within three years of the date of the permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

In granting permission the local planning authority had regard to the following policies:-

1. The relevant policies of the Unitary Development Plan are SP1, BE1, BE3-7, BE10-14, BE16-18, SP6, AR1-AR5, SP10-11, NC3, NC4, EP8, SP7, RO9, SP18, SP25, T4, T23, T28-30, T44-46, SP30-32, H2 and H11
2. The relevant policies of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan) are SP1-3, UD1-2, UD4, UD5, UD6, UD7, UD10, UD13, UD14, SP4, RO8, UC14-UC17, SP9, NC3, NC4, SP11-12, EP5, EP7, EP22, SP16, T6,T7, T11, T30, T42-43, SP19-24 and H2.

The development is considered to be satisfactory in relation to the following:-

- (a) the appearance of the development in the street scene
- (b) the relationship of the development to adjacent property
- (c) the character of the development in the surrounding area
- (d) the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (e) the light and outlook of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (f) the privacy of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (g) the relationship of the development to trees to be retained
- (h) the safety of pedestrians and motorists on the adjacent highway
- (i) the safety and security of buildings and the spaces around them
- (j) accessibility to buildings
- (k) the housing policies of the development plan
- (l) the archaeology policies of the development plan
- (m) the preservation or enhancement of the conservation area
- (n) the character, quality and setting of the Local Area of Special Character
- (o) maintaining the open character of the Metropolitan Green Belt
- (p) the open land and outdoor recreation policies of the development plan
- (q) the urban design policies of the development plan
- (r) the nature conservation policies of the development plan
- (x) the transport policies of the development plan

and having regard to all other matters raised.

APPLICATION NUMBER 05/4475/P – Hydon Cottage, Hollymeoak Road, Coulsdon.

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 3 detached five bedroom houses with integral double garages and formation of vehicular accesses onto Starrock Road and Hollymeoak Road.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Grant planning permission subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the agenda.
-

3. BACKGROUND

a) Site Description

- 3.1 The site lies to the south side of Hollymeoak Road and to the north-west of Starrock Road and has frontages of 29m and 37m respectively to the two roads. It has an area of approximately 0.2ha. Land levels fall steeply from south to north; however they level off near the middle of the site towards Hollymeoak Road.
- 3.2 Starrock Road has a narrow footway and verge on its north-western side outside the site, Hollymeoak Road has no footways. There are two apple trees on the eastern boundary. Next to the western elevation of the current property there is a semi-mature sycamore and there is a mature beech along the western boundary. Along the southern boundary with Starrock Road there are two groups of trees including a sycamore and a silver birch. Trees in close proximity to the site at No. 15 Hollymeoak Road are protected by TPO 35, 1970. The site is not within an Archaeology Priority Zone. The Archaeology Priority Zone is on the eastern side of Starrock Road.
- 3.3 Land to the north of the site is designated as Metropolitan Green Belt. The area is predominantly residential in character. Hollymeoak Road has a rural country lane character comprising detached houses and bungalows set in spacious well treed grounds. The parts of Starrock Road to the south of the site comprise a mixture of houses and bungalows, with some infill and tandem development and some new development served by new estate roads. The immediate adjoining dwellings are 'Blue Cedar' a bungalow with rooms in the roof, No. 9 Hollymeoak road, a bungalow with rooms in the roof and No. 15 Hollymeoak Road which is a detached two storey house.

b) Planning History

- 3.4 88/1461/P - Permission refused for erection of a detached dwelling.
- 3.5 04/3683/P - Permission refused for demolition of existing buildings; erection of 2 detached four bedroom houses with integral double garages and two detached five bedroom houses with integral double garages; formation of vehicular accesses onto Starrock Road and Hollymeoak Road. This application was refused by the Council for five reasons relating to impact of the proposal on the character of the area, the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, highway implications of the development, impact on the archaeological heritage of the site and that it would not incorporate satisfactory measures to ensure access for disabled persons. On 18th August 2005 the application was dismissed on appeal because of the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, highway safety in Hollymeoak Road and that it would be prejudicial to any archaeological interest that the site may have.
- 3.6 05/365/P – Planning permission refused for demolition of existing building; erection of 3 detached five bedroom houses with integral double garages; formation of vehicular accesses onto Starrock Road and Hollymeoak Road. This application was refused by the Council for five reasons relating to impact of the proposal on the character of the area, the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, highway implications of the development, impact on the archaeological heritage of the site and that it would not incorporate satisfactory measures to ensure access for disabled persons. On 18th August 2005 the application was dismissed on appeal because of the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and that it would be prejudicial to any archaeological interest that the site may have.

c) Proposal

- 3.7 This report concerns an application for full planning permission for the erection of three detached five bedroom houses with integral double garages and the formation of vehicular accesses onto Starrock Road and Hollymeoak Road.
- 3.8 The proposal would involve two houses being erection fronting the Starrock Road frontage and one fronting Hollymeoak Road. The proposed house fronting Hollymeoak Road would have overall maximum dimensions of 11.4m in depth, 16m in width and a maximum height of 8.7m. The dwelling would be some 8.2m from the northern boundary (with Hollymeoak Road), 8m from the western boundary and 5.7m from the eastern boundary. The proposed dwelling would have a rear garden of some 13m in length. There would be approximately 27m between the house fronting Hollymeoak Road (Plot 3) and the two houses fronting Starrock Road (Plots 1 and 2)
- 3.9 There are two houses proposed fronting Starrock Road. They would have overall maximum dimensions of 9.3m in height, 12m in depth and 12.2m in width. Plot 1 would retain 4m to the western boundary and plot 2 would retain 2.8m to the eastern boundary. There would be 2.7m between these houses. The houses would retain a minimum of 7m from the Starrock Road boundary. The houses would have a rear garden length of some 13m. The floor area of the houses would be 720 sq. m.

- 3.10 The houses would be of a traditional design; however plot 1 and plot 2 would have an unusual gabled roof design, i.e. a peaked gable on top of a hipped roof.
- 3.11 A vehicular access onto Hollymeoak Road and two onto Starrock Road are proposed.
- 3.12 The proposed materials are yellow stock facing brick with Redland plain concrete roof tiles in granular brown finish.

4. PLANNING POLICIES

- 4.1 The relevant policies of the Unitary Development Plan are SP1, BE1, BE3-7, BE10-14, BE16-18, SP6, AR1-AR5, SP10-11, NC3, NC4, EP8, SP7, RO9, SP18, SP25, T4, T23, T28-30, T44-46, SP30-32, H2 and H11.
- 4.2 The policies of the Second Deposit Draft Replacement Unitary Development Plan (referred to as the Croydon Plan) which would amend the above and which impact upon the proposal are SP1-3, UD1-2, UD4, UD5, UD6, UD7, UD10, UD13, UD14, SP4, RO8, UC14-UC17, SP9, NC3, NC4, SP11-12, EP5, EP7, EP22, SP16, T6, T7, T11, T30, T42-43, SP19-24 and H2.

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 35 adjoining and neighbouring residential occupiers were notified of the application. 12 letters of representation have been received. The following issues were raised:
 - a) Cramped development;
 - b) Visually intrusive;
 - c) Loss of privacy;
 - d) Out of character;
 - e) Loss of trees and hedges;
 - f) Site is within Archaeology Priority Zone;
 - g) Accesses would have adverse impact on highway safety;
 - h) Would harm views from the Green Belt;
 - i) Disabled access is inadequate;
 - j) It is queried why the existing building has to be demolished;
 - k) The site has a low PTAL;
 - l) Density is excessive;
 - m) Would put strain on the local community by bringing an urban 'feel' to the area;
 - n) Would result in reduction in value of existing houses;
 - o) Loss of light;
 - p) Loss of views;
 - q) Dirt, noise and pollution during construction;
- 5.2 One letter of representation has been received from 'Residents Against Insensitive Development' (RAID). They have the following comments to make:-
 - a) the development is out of keeping with the character of the area, would harm views of the hill side and the green belt;

- b) that it constitutes overdevelopment of the site;
- c) that it would have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers;
- d) that it would compromise public safety of the highway; and
- e) would put at risk the archaeological heritage of the site;

5.3 English Heritage were notified of the application. A trial trench evaluation has been undertaken at the site and an archaeological report has been submitted by the applicant to English Heritage. They have recommended the approval of the report and have commented that there is no discernable further archaeological interest with the site.

6. CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The principal issues to be considered are:

- a) the effect of the development on:
 - i) The character of the area and appearance of the street scene;
 - ii) The amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties;
 - iii) Views of the hillside and from the Green Belt
 - iv) Impact upon the archaeological heritage of the Borough.
- b) The access, parking and turning arrangements.

Effect on the streetscene, the character of the area

6.2 In considering the effect of the dismissed scheme, for one dwelling on the Hollymeoak Road, frontage the Inspector commented that the proposal would:

“.....allow a more generous landscaped setting to be provided for the house, more akin to existing development in Hollymeoak Road. It would not, in my view, endanger the protected tree which would still be seen in its entirety by those passing up and down Hollymeoak Road. The distance to the boundary with 9 Hollymeoak Road would avoid an overpowering relationship between Plot 3 and the adjacent garden land. The absence of projections thrusting forward from the main front elevation would assist in assimilating the dwelling into the existing street scene. It would stand closer to the highway than its neighbour at No. 15 Hollymeoak Road, but there would be a gap of nearly 10m between the buildings and I do not consider that the visual relationship between them would appear uncomfortably cramped”

6.3 The current proposal for the Hollymeoak Road frontage is the same as that which was the subject of the appeal. It is considered in light of the recent appeal decision that the issues pertaining to the impact of this house on the character and appearance of the streetscene of Hollymeoak Road are satisfactory and as such the proposal is acceptable.

6.4 In considering the effect of the dismissed schemes for two dwellings on the Starrock Road frontage the Inspector commented that:

“The insertion of two identical houses into the street scene would not be incongruous in this setting. Plot 1 in both schemes has a similar relationship to Blue Cedar, and I

consider it to be a satisfactory one” and “Plot 2 would stand only about 7m from the highway boundary at the eastern end of the site and only about 2m from the boundary with 9 Hollymeoak Road. At that point, Plot 2 in scheme B would be almost 1m above ground level at the highway boundary and almost 2m above existing ground level at the side boundary. The forward siting and relative elevation of both proposals compared with No. 9, would render both extremely prominent in the street scene. There would be no scope for structural landscaping to soften the visual impact of the proposed buildings, owing to the proximity of the side boundary. Whilst I consider that there is scope for two houses on the Starrock Road frontage, both of the appeal schemes would, in my view appear too cramped and over dominant in the street scene”.

- 6.5 The agent has stated that the proposed houses for Plot 1 and Plot 2 “take the appearance of bungalows when viewed from Starrock Road”. The dwellings proposed for Plot 1 and Plot 2 that were dismissed on appeal were two storey houses when viewed from Starrock Road.
- 6.6 The house at Plot 2 dismissed on appeal was 1.8m from the boundary with No 9 Hollymeoak Road, the current proposal provides 2.8m. The distance to the boundary with Starrock Road would increase by 1m over the dismissed scheme. The house proposed for Plot 2 and dismissed at appeal had a ridge height of 9.8m in width, eaves height of 5m and had a two storey frontage of 9.8m when measured from the front elevation. The current proposals for Plots 1 and 2 when measured from the front elevation have a ridge height of 6.7m and an eaves height of 2.3m. The reduction in height, bulk, massing of the houses on both Plot 1 and 2 and increase in distance to the boundary as shown on the proposed scheme is considered to represent an improvement on the dismissed scheme.
- 6.7 It should also be noted that the plans indicate that the finished floor levels of the houses would be generally reduced over that dismissed at appeal, for example, the lower ground floor of plot 2 would have a finished floor level of 112.50m as compared with 113.25m in the dismissed scheme. The floor level at the front would be 115.13 as compared with 114.60m in the dismissed scheme, however the house would only be one storey in height now. It is considered that Plot 2 would not appear overly prominent when viewed from Starrock Road. Given that the current proposal constitutes a reduction in the bulk, mass and height of the house proposed for plot 1 it is considered that it further improves the impact on the streetscene when compared to the proposal which the inspector viewed to be ‘satisfactory’. Given this reduction in bulk and massing for Plot 1 and Plot 2 and the distance now proposed to the boundaries it is not considered that the proposed scheme detract from the character and appearance of the area or visual amenities of the streetscene.

Impact on visual amenities of the Green Belt and views of wooded Hillside and Ridges

- 6.8 Having regard to the distance between the house proposed at Plot 3 to the side boundaries, distance from Hollymeoak Road and lack of projections in the elevational treatment it is considered that the proposal would not unduly impact on views from within the Green Belt. This was considered to be the case by the inspector. Given the reduced bulk and mass of the dwellings on Plot 1 and Plot 2 it is not considered that

they would result in undue harm in terms of views from the Green Belt or views of the Wooded Hillside/Ridge.

Impact on the amenities of adjoining and neighbouring occupiers

6.9 In terms of this issue the inspector commented on the previous two schemes that:

“on balance I do not consider that either scheme causes, in the words of policy UD6, ‘undue visual intrusion [or] loss of privacy’ or fails to maintain adequate levels of sunlight and daylight for adjoining occupiers”

The proposed houses would not have windows at ground floor level in side flank elevations other than those which serve non-habitable rooms and could be fitted with obscure glass. At lower ground floor level any overlooking from windows could be adequately mitigated by the insertion of a fence which could be conditioned as part of a landscaping scheme in any grant of planning permission. Given the reduction in bulk, mass and height of House Plot 1 and 2 it is considered to represent an improvement on what the inspector found acceptable. Plot 3 would not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining/neighbouring occupiers and the proposal is considered to accord with Policies BE16 and BE17 of the UDP and UD6 of the Croydon Plan.

Impact upon the archaeological heritage of the Borough

6.10 English Heritage have received information in relation to the archaeological implications of the development and have commented that “there is no discernable further archaeological interest with the site”. Having regard to these comments, it is considered that the proposal would not impact on the archaeological heritage of the site and would comply with Policies UC14 of the UDP and the Croydon Plan.

Access, parking and turning arrangements

6.11 In terms of Plot 3 the inspector commented:

“The access proposed in Appeal B would also fall short of the required visibility splays, but by placing the access further from the western boundary, there would be some improvement in the current situation, and I do not consider that the failure to achieve the full visibility splay militates against Appeal B in these circumstances”.

The access arrangement to Plot 3 currently under consideration is the same as that which was the subject of the appeal (Appeal B). Although the proposal would not accord with the required sight lines of 2.4 metres x 70 metres it is considered that it would be inappropriate to recommend a refusal of planning permission on these grounds. It is considered that the parking provision is acceptable and that a refusal based on the grounds of inadequate parking provision could not be sustained.

6.12 It is considered that pedestrian visibility splays could be achieved on the Starrock Road frontage and it is recommended that details of these should be conditioned in any grant of planning permission. Pedestrian visibility splays would not be required on the Hollymeoak Road frontage as there is no pedestrian footway. Given the small

scale of this development it is considered that the traffic generation would be minimal and would not be a sufficient reason to refuse planning permission.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 In line with the objectives of PPG3, The UDP and the Croydon Plan the development would make more efficient use of an existing 'brownfield' site.

8. EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The plans indicate that there would be level access to the principle entrances. There are no other equal opportunity implications arising.

Case Officer: Emma Doyle

Background Documents: Twelve letters of representation from nearby occupiers.
One letter from Residents Against Insensitive Development
One letter from English Heritage
Appeal decision dated 18th August

Contact Officer: Philip Mills Tel 020 8760 5419