

Agenda Item: 6.3

07/00736/P

26/03/2007

South Norwood

Application for full planning permission

Agent:

Kuma Environmental Design Ltd
76 Beulah Road
Thornton Heath
Surrey
CR7 8JF

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs Bucknall
76 Warminster Road
South Norwood
London
SE25 4DQ

Location: 76 Warminster Road, South Norwood, London, SE254DQ

Description: Retention of front boundary wall

Drawing No(s): 01,02,03

Recommendation: **Refuse Permission**

Reason(s) for refusal :-

1. The development is detrimental to the setting of the locally listed building which it adjoins and to the visual amenity of the street scene by reason of its scale, design and prominent siting and thereby conflicts with Policies UD2, UD3 and UC9 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan)
2. The development does not provide satisfactory visibility splays and is prejudicial to highway safety contrary to Policy T11 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan)

Ward: South Norwood
Lead Officer: Head of Planning Control

PLANNING COMMITTEE
24th May 2007

Application Number: 07/00736/P - 76 Warminster Road South Norwood

1. SUMMARY

1.1 Full application for:

Retention of front boundary wall

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Refuse planning permission, for the reasons set out in the agenda:

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Site Description

- The subject site comprises a building which is a two storey double fronted dwelling house located on the western side of Warminster Road.
- The property is included in the UDP local list as a building of architectural or historic interest.
- A boundary wall has been erected which measured on site as between 1.76m to 2.14m in height (to the highest point of the piers) from the highway ground level. This extends along the entire frontage width approximately 45 metres in length.
- The area is residential in character.
- Site area is 1.125ha.
- The garden is raised as the land rises up from the highway, to approximately 1 metre above the ground level from the boundary. Adjacent to the wall are a number of trees and shrubs.

3.2 Surrounding Area

- Semi-detached dwelling house to the north, converted into two flats
- Detached dwelling house to the south
- Purpose built block of flats opposite
- Backs onto semi-detached and detached houses on Lancaster Road.

3.3 Designations

- Locally listed as a building of architectural or historic interest

3.4 Relevant history

05/0747/C- This is an enforcement file regarding the erection of a brick wall.

05/04669/P This application for the retention of a front boundary wall was withdrawn on 20.12.2005.

06/0799/LE This is an application for a lawful development certificate regarding the retention of front boundary wall. It was refused on 28th April 2006 as the wall constituted development requiring planning permission.

3.5 Proposal

Full permission is sought for:

- Retention of front boundary wall.
- The plans indicate a boundary wall 45m in length, adjacent to the highway.
- The street elevation shows the wall to be constructed in facing brick, connected by piers. The height of the wall (to the top of the piers) varies between 1.76m to 2.14m.
- The materials used are Marshalls Cambridge Burwell White bricks bonded in the Flemish garden wall pattern.
- There are 3 vehicular accesses along the length of the wall

4 PLANNING POLICIES:

- 4.1 The relevant policies of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (the Croydon Plan) are SP2, SP3, UD1, UD2, UD8, UD15, SP4, UC9, and T11.

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 40 Adjoining occupiers, notified .No replies have been received.

- 5.2 The Norwood Society have commented as follows;-

- The boundary wall reflects careful treatment; the material used should weather in an appropriate fashion. There is a harmony in relation to the brickwork of the dwelling house.
- The construction is of a high standard and would fit well with the wrought-iron gates at the entrances. The wall's height is justified, in relation to being needed as a retaining structure to accommodate pressure from the garden side and as safe edge to users of the raised garden.
- The wall is appropriate to the setting and would have been appropriate when the house was built.

- 5.3 An Urban Design officer has commented as follows;-

- Retention of the wall in it's current form is totally unacceptable
- Design is poor and wall is unacceptably high
- Wall should be reduced in height to 800-1000mm along entire length, with the higher level space between the piers in-filled with railings of a design to be approved.

- 5.4 Transportation have commented that the application has unsatisfactory provision for pedestrian visibility splays and sightlines resulting in detriment to the existing highway conditions, and would also be detrimental to highway safety and would not be acceptable.

- 6.3 Councillor Sue Bennett has referred the application and is supportive of the development.
- Very important locally listed building.

6.0 **CONSIDERATIONS**

The Principle of Development.

- 6.1 Policy UC9 of the Croydon Plan states that when considering schemes affecting buildings on the Local List, substantial weight will be given to the benefit of protecting and conserving the particular interest that accounts for their designation. In principle, any development which affects the intrinsic quality of the townscape or the setting of the building should consequently seek to protect the character and setting of such buildings when being considered.

Townscape issues

- 6.2 The street scene is affected by the proposal as the current height of the wall together with its dense construction serves to shield the building from the street scene to an unacceptable degree. The previous wall, as stated by the applicant in their submission was a combination of stone, clay, tiles, rubble and concrete blocks. Above this was a timber panel fence, up to 2.5m in height according to the applicant. It is not possible to comment upon the previous wall's impact but only to affirm that at that height it would have normally needed permission.
- 6.3 The main consideration here is that the intrinsic quality of the building is largely lost from the street scene and because of the building's classification as a building of architectural interest this is detrimental to the townscape. The blocking effect of the wall, the loss of visual amenity interest, and the disruption to the uniform pattern of the street scene, are all factors considered to cause detriment.
- 6.4 Warminster Road is characterised by a mix in style of residential enclosures, most of which are low in height. These serve to be open to the properties, they enclose, enhancing the visual amenity of the street scene as a result. Where, there is a high enclosure such as a panel fence this does not have such an obvious effect visually due to the difference in bulk.
- 6.5 It is not disputed that the wall has been built to a high standard, or that a brick type that is sympathetic to the appearance of the main house has been used. However, it is considered that the wall's appearance would benefit from the upper section of brickwork being removed, thus reducing the height to about 800mm-100mm whilst retaining the piers. The higher level space between the piers created by the section of wall removed should then be in-filled with railings of a design to be approved.

Amenities of adjoining and nearby occupiers

- 6.6 The effects to be considered concern the standard of residential amenity afforded to adjoining occupiers (loss of light, overlooking, and loss of privacy). These are not considered to warrant a refusal. The physical location of the wall on the highway does not impact on any adjoining property.

Highways and parking

- 6.7 Adequate pedestrian visibility splays measuring 1.5m x 1.5m with no obstruction greater than 0.6m in the splayed areas need to be provided, at each vehicular access point. The entrances as they have been constructed do not provide adequate visibility. The retention of the wall in its present form therefore constitutes a reduction in terms of highway safety. The present 2m width accesses have piers at either side, and it is considered this need to be altered in order to achieve an acceptable level of highway safety.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 As above

8. EQUALITIES CONSIDERATIONS

- 8.1 There are no equalities considerations arising from the proposal.

Case Officer: Laurie Pocock
Background Documents: Letter from Norwood Society
Observations from Urban Design Team
Referral from Councillor Bennett.

Contact Officer: Mr. P. Mills 020 8760 5419