

**Agenda Item: 6.2**

**This is a Major Application for which the 13 week period expires on 08/12/2006.**

06/03769/P

08/09/2006

Waddon

Application for full planning permission

Agent:

Shaw Design Services Ltd

Dalquieth

Northlands Road

Holbrook, Horsham West Sussex

RH12 5PW

Applicant:

Garrick Homes Ltd

18 The Castle

Holbrook

Horsham West Sussex

RH12 5PX

Location: 180-182 Pampisford Road, South Croydon, CR2 6DB

Description: Demolition of existing buildings; erection of 2 two storey buildings with accommodation in roofspace to provide 10 two bedroom and 3 one bedroom flats; formation of vehicular access and provision of associated parking spaces

Drawing No(s): 623/01-12 inc.

Recommendation: **Refuse Permission**

Reason(s) for refusal :-

1. The siting, massing and design of the development would not respect or improve the existing pattern of buildings and the spaces between them, nor maximise the opportunities for creating an attractive and interesting environment and would thereby conflict with Policies SP3, UD2 and UD3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan)
2. The development would result in an unsatisfactory residential environment being provided for the occupiers of the proposed dwellings by reason of the inadequate private amenity space and would thereby conflict with Policy UD8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan)
3. The development would have an over provision of car parking with a lack of disabled parking space within the site and would thereby conflict with Policy T8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan)
4. The development does not demonstrate that satisfactory pedestrian visibility splays would be achievable and would therefore be prejudicial to highway safety contrary to Policy T11 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan)

Application Number: 06/3769/P – 180-182 Pampisford Road, South Croydon

---

## 1. SUMMARY

### 1.1 Full application for:

- demolition of the existing buildings
- erection of 2 three-storey buildings comprising 13 flats
- 14 parking spaces.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the Agenda

---

## 3. BACKGROUND

### 3.1 Site Description

- The site is predominantly flat and is occupied by 2 two-storey houses which front Pampisford Road. The houses are set back about 13m from the frontage and the rear gardens back onto Blackford Close, a cul-de-sac which runs parallel to Pampisford Road.
- The site is broadly rectangular in shape, although it follows the curve of Pampisford Road at its eastern end. It has a frontage of approximately 37m and a maximum depth of 54m
- The site area is 0.19ha
- There are a number of trees along the boundaries of both properties and particularly along the rear boundary with Blackford Close where there are a number of cypress trees. Two Cedar trees towards the eastern end of the gardens are protected by Tree Preservation Order 37, 1983.

### 3.2 Surrounding Area

- Uses - Mainly residential in character. A number of the large detached houses have been subject to redevelopment for flats, such as 172-174 Pampisford Road, recently completed.
- Form – no. 184 Pampisford Road to the north is a detached 2-storey dwelling, similar to the application properties and no. 178 to the south is a substantial bungalow with some accommodation in the roof. There are a number of trees along the northern boundary with the application site.
- To the rear of the site is Blackford Close with modest two-storey link detached houses on the opposite side of the road facing the application site

### 3.3 Designations

- Pampisford Road is a Local Distributor Road, with some on-street parking restrictions in the immediate vicinity. The site is within an Archaeological Priority Zone on the UDP Proposals Map.

### 3.4 Relevant history

- In respect of 180 Pampisford Road, permission was refused in 1987 (87/2092/P) for a detached house with integral garage at the rear. In 1988, an appeal was dismissed in respect of application ref. 87/580/P for the erection of a chalet bungalow and integral garage with access from Blackford Close
- 05/157/P- In April 2005, permission was refused for the demolition of the existing houses and erection of 2 three-storey buildings each comprising 6 two-bedroom flats (with each flat having an area of 65sq.m). The grounds of refusal related to: the siting, massing and layout not respecting the existing pattern of buildings and spacing; the access and parking being detrimental to the occupiers of Blackford Close by reason of excess parking provision; poor layout resulting in noise and disturbance; not make the best use of land for housing in terms of a comprehensive approach; no environmental performance statement and no provision for enhancement of a nearby open space. An Appeal against this decision was dismissed on 20 February 2006.
- The Inspector was concerned that the identical blocks of flats would harm to the appearance of the street scene by reasons of bulk and design and there being a lack of spacing between the buildings. He was also concerned about the scheme's failure to demonstrate the environmental sustainability of the proposal.
- In respect of 176 Pampisford Road, permission was refused in 2005 for a two/three storey building for 10 flats and 10 parking spaces (04/4931/P).

### 3.5 Proposal

Full planning permission is sought for the erection of 2 three-storey buildings with accommodation in the roof space to provide 13 flats with a parking area at the rear and vehicular access from Blackford Close. The development shows:

- Frontage width of each building of 16.5m & 14.5m; the height of each would be 10.5m & 9.5m; and the maximum depth 16m & 14m. The buildings would be set back between 11m and 14m from the front boundary. The total gross external floor space is given as 1080sq.m.
- Facing materials of red/brown stock brickwork with a rendered finish and reconstituted stone string course with hipped concrete interlocking tiled roofs. The buildings would have gabled features to the front with dormer windows in the roof space.
- 13 flats – of which 10 are two bedroom and 3 are one bedroom units.
- Unit sizes range between 50-97sq.m
- 14 parking spaces accessed from Blackford Close with electronically operated gates to access. An area for the refuse/cycle store is shown next to the access entrance.
- Separate pedestrian access to each building from Pampisford Road with access from the car parking area via a path between the new buildings
- Amenity areas to front and rear with a rear depth between 3-6m
- Boundary fencing and vegetation retained and supplemented where necessary. Dwarf wall and metal railings above provided to front boundary.

- 3.6 The applicant has stated they are prepared to enter into a unilateral undertaking for financial contributions towards community facilities or the enhancement of nearby open space, should planning permission be granted.

#### 4. **PLANNING POLICIES:**

- Replacement Unitary Development Plan: SP1-3, UD1-3, UD6-8, UD12-15, SP4, UC11, SP7, RO12, SP8, NC4, SP9-10, SP13, EP1, EP6, EP16, SP14, T2, T4, T8, T11, SP18, SP20, H2, H14.

#### 5. **CONSULTATIONS**

- Advertised in press as a major application
- 30 adjacent occupiers notified. 3 replies.  
Main grounds of objection/concerns:
  1. access and parking arrangements would be detrimental to the residential occupiers of Blackford Close by reason of excess parking provision and a poor layout resulting in noise and general disturbance, including light pollution from car headlights
  2. access would dangerous for existing users of Blackford Close
  3. loss of trees
  4. loss of light and privacy
  5. if granted any potential redevelopment of 178 Pampisford Road should not be compromised
  6. if granted safety fencing should be erected to minimize impact of building works and should also protect amenities following completion of development
  7. a similar planning application has already been refused (05/157/P)
- The application has been referred by Councillor Simon Hoar on the grounds that it would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, would provide additional undesirable pressure on local utilities, would be out of keeping with surrounding houses and would increase traffic along Blackford Close to the detriment of neighbours.
- English Heritage have been consulted as the site lies within an Archaeology Priority Zone, and they recommend the imposition of a standard condition to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work should planning permission be granted.

#### 6. **CONSIDERATIONS**

##### Use policies

- 6.1 The principle of a redevelopment for residential use is acceptable. Although the site area is less than 0.25hectare, the development would have a density of 160 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) which would be within the required density range of 150 to 250 hrh of Policy H9 of the Croydon Plan. However, there is also the over-riding need to ensure that the development is satisfactory in all other respects.
- 6.2 Because of its size the development would generate a need for public open space that cannot be provided on site. The applicants have indicated that they would be willing to enter into a Unilateral Undertaking relating to financial contributions towards community facilities and the enhancement of nearby public open space.

This would be in accordance with Planning Guidance Note No 1 and Policy RO12 of the UDP.

#### Townscape issues

- 6.3 The previous appeal Inspector was concerned about the identical blocks of flats harming the appearance of the street scene, and their bulk and design eroding the character of this part of Pampisford Road, their design “being more akin to developments further to the north”. He was concerned that the views available above the garages of the existing houses “would be lost to the development, which would fill a major proportion of the site’s width with 3 storey buildings. The siting and massing of the development would not respect or improve the existing pattern of buildings and the spaces between them.....” Although the current scheme has provided two buildings with their own individual identity, the bulkiness of the buildings has not substantially changed and the poor quality pastiche design and inappropriate massing with large roofs would be detrimental to the character of this part of the road. The scheme therefore does not overcome the townscape and design reasons for refusal of the previous application and the comments made by the appeal Inspector.

#### Amenities of adjoining and nearby occupiers

- 6.4 The southern building would be 1.6m from the boundary with 178 Pampisford Road and the northern building 1.2m from the boundary with no. 184. This would be marginally worse than the relationships shown on the previous scheme, although not so significant as to warrant refusal on this ground alone. Subject to appropriate conditions overlooking and loss of privacy could be minimised to an acceptable level.
- 6.5 The Inspector on the appeal scheme looked at the issue raised previously about the position and use of the proposed rear car park. He concluded that the parking arrangements were similar to those for the recently completed development at 172/174 Pampisford Road and that the position of this car park would be not unlike many others in urban areas and there would be no unacceptable impact through visual intrusion or loss of privacy. Accordingly, it is considered that a refusal on disturbance grounds could not be substantiated.

#### Amenities of future occupiers

- 6.6 A small area of private amenity space for the occupiers of the development is provided at the rear as much of the space is taken up by the front garden, the set back of the buildings and the parking. This could be improved by a reduction in the number of units and appropriate parking spaces for the development.

- 6.7 All of the flats would have adequate floor areas.

#### Security

- 6.8 The proposed car park would be overlooked and development would be reasonably secure with regard to designing out crime. There would be electrically operated entrance gates for the rear car park.

#### Highways and parking

- 6.9 The site is within an area of poor accessibility to public transport. 14 parking spaces are proposed which is one above the maximum required by current UDP standards. The over provision of parking would discourage the use of sustainable

transport contrary to Policy T8 of the UDP. It has not been demonstrated that the necessary pedestrian visibility splays are achievable.

- 6.10 No details have been provided of the cycle/refuse store next to the access entrance. If this application is approved there would be 50 existing and approved dwellings served by the carriageway. This is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.11 As this is a development of more than 10 dwellings, there would be a financial contribution towards Sustainable Transport were permission to be granted.

#### Trees

- 6.12 The two protected mature Cedar trees at the rear of the site would not be directly affected by the development, although they would need to be protected by fencing during any construction work. Other trees would not be significantly affected.

### **7. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The application was not supported by a detailed statement on the environmental sustainability of the proposal, although the applicant has indicated that consideration would be given to the installation of solar water heating for the development. The Inspector in dismissing the previous appeal was concerned that this matter should not be left to be dealt with by condition and that in order not to reduce the value of the UDP policy ...“a sustainable approach is taken to the design of development from the outset...” However, Government advice is that reasons for refusal should not relate to matters which can be dealt with by conditions, as is the case in this instance.

### **8. EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 No disabled person’s car parking spaces are shown  
Level Access would be secured under the Building Regulations.

---

Case Officer: John Lawson

Background Documents: 3 replies from 2 nearby occupiers  
Referral from Councillor Simon Hoar  
Letter from English Heritage

Contact Officer: Mr. P. Mills 020 8760 5419