

Appendix 4 - Saved Unitary Development Plan policies to be deleted upon adoption of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals DPD

The following policies of the Saved Unitary Development Plan will be deleted upon adoption of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals DPD.

Urban Design

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
UD2	Layout and Sitting of New Development		DM10
UD3	Scale and Design of New Buildings		DM10
UD4	Shopfront Design		DM11
UD5	Advertisements		DM10 DM12
UD6	Safety and Security		DM10
UD7	Inclusive Design		DM10
UD8	Protecting Residential Amenity		DM10
UD9	Wooded Hillside and Ridges		DM10
UD11	Views and Landmarks		DM10 DM16
UD12	New Street Design and Layout		DM10

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
UD13	Parking Design and Layout		DM10
UD14	Landscape Design		DM10 DM26
UD15	Refuse and Recycling Storage		DM13
UD16	Public Art		DM14

Urban Conservation and Archaeology

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
UC2	Control of Demolition in Conservation Areas		DM17
UC3	Development Proposals in Conservation Areas		DM17
UC4	Changes of Use in Conservation Areas		DM17

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
UC5	Local Areas of Special Character		DM17
UC8	Use of Listed Buildings		DM17
UC9	Buildings on the Local List		DM17
UC10	Historic Parks and Gardens		DM17
UC11	Development Proposals on Archaeological Sites		DM17
UC13	Preserving Locally Important Remains		DM17
UC14	Enabling Development		DM17

Open Land and Outdoor Recreation

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
RO1	Maintaining open character of Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land		DM24
RO2	Control of Development Associated with Residential Properties in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land		DM24
RO3	Changes of Use of Existing Buildings in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land		DM24
RO4	Conversions of buildings to residential use in Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land		DM24

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
RO6	Protecting the Setting of the Metropolitan Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land		DM24
RO7	Cane Hill Hospital Site		DM35
RO8	Protecting Local Open Land		DM24
RO9	Education Open Space		DM24
RO10	Education Open Space		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
RO12	Local Open Land in residential schemes		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
RO15	Outdoor Space and Recreation		DM24
RO16	Selhurst Park		

Nature Conservation

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
NC1	Sites of Nature Conservation Importance		DM25
NC2	Specially Protected and Priority Species and their Habitats		DM25
NC3	Nature Conservation Opportunities throughout the Borough		DM25
NC4	Woodland, Trees and Hedgerows		DM25 DM26

Environmental Protection

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
EP1	Control of Potentially Polluting Uses		DM21
EP2	Land Contamination – Ensuring land is suitable for development		DM22

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
EP3	Land Contamination – Development on land known to be contaminated		DM22
EP8	New Waste Management Facilities		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and the South London Waste Plan
EP9	Loss of Existing Waste Management Facilities		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and the South London Waste Plan

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
EP11	Hazardous Installations		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
EP15	Renewable Energy		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
EP16	Incorporating Renewable Energy into New Developments		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan

Transport

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
T2	Traffic Generation from Development		DM27
T4	Cycling		DM27
T6	Development at Railway Stations		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
T8	Car Parking Standards in New Development		DM28

Economic Activity

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
EM2	Industry and Warehousing in Employment Areas		DM9
EM3	Industry and Warehousing outside Employment Areas		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
EM4	Offices outside Croydon Metropolitan Centre and Town Centres		DM8
EM5	Retaining Industrial and Warehousing Uses Outside Designated Locations		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
EM6	Redevelopment or Extension for Industrial or Warehousing Uses Outside Employment Areas		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
EM7	Redevelopment or Extension for Offices outside Croydon Metropolitan Centre and the Town, District and Local Centres		DM8

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
H5	Back Land and Back Garden Development		DM2
H7	Conversions		DM1
H8	Conversion of Dwellings to Non Self-Contained Units		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
H11	Retaining Small Houses		DM1
H12	Residential Care Homes		DM3

Housing

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
H1	Retention of Residential Uses		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
H2	Supply of New Housing		
H3	Planning Commitments and Identifying Housing Sites		DM31 – DM47

Shopping

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
SH3	Control of Retail Units outside Primary Shopping Areas		DM4 DM8
SH4	Retail Vitality within Main Retail Frontages and Shopping Area Frontages		DM4
SH5	Retail Vitality within Secondary Retail Frontages		DM4
SH6	Retail Vitality within Shopping Parades		DM6
SH7	Loss of Convenience Shops		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan

Hotels and Tourism

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
HT1	Visitor Accommodation		DM8

Leisure and Indoor Recreation

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
LR2	Development of Leisure and Indoor Sports, Arts, Culture and Entertainment Facilities outside of Croydon Metropolitan Centre and town and district centres		DM8
LR3	Retaining Existing Leisure and Indoor Sports, Arts, Culture and Entertainment Facilities		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan

Community Services

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
CS1	Development of New Community Facilities		DM18 DM19 DM20
CS2	Retaining Existing Community Facilities		DM18 DM19
CS5	Capacity of Off-Site Service Infrastructure		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan
CS6	Tele-communications		DM30
CS7	Surplus Land		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan

Croydon Metropolitan Centre

UDP Policy	Title	Remove	Detailed Policies
SP28	Regeneration of Croydon Metropolitan Centre		Rely on National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and the Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework

Comments and Council's response by Consultation Document

CLP2 - Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options)

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0004/03/002/Non-specific/C	Amanda Purdye <i>Gatwick Airport</i>		Comment			Our only concern would be be if any wind turbines were proposed at this distance from the airport.		No change	The comment is noted. There are currently no proposals for wind turbines in Croydon beyond those on domestic and commercial buildings.
0004/03/001/Non-specific/C	Amanda Purdye <i>Gatwick Airport</i>		Comment			Croydon Local Plan Area is outside of 'physical' 15km safeguarding area and therefore have no concerns regarding aerodrome safeguarding.		No change	Comment is noted.
0010/05/003/Non-specific/O	Ms Rose Freeman <i>The Theatres Trust</i>		Object						
0054/05/012/Non-specific/C	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>		Comment			Section 4.4.4 of Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report- SuDS are not only applicable to reducing sewer flooding, but can be applied to reducing risk from all sources of flooding, including surface water flooding.	Amend this paragraph to detail that SuDS can be applied to reducing risk from all sources of flooding.	No change	A Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal setting out the proposed sustainability indicators was consulted upon in summer 2012. As a statutory consultee the Environment Agency were consulted. This matter should have been addressed as part of this consultation.
0054/05/009/Non-specific/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>		Object			In the biodiversity, flora and fauna theme in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Document, an objective to protect and improve green corridors would be a valuable addition as these would enable wildlife to move between the boroughs greenspaces and semi-natural habitats.	Addition of an objective to protect and improve green corridors.	No change	A Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal setting out the proposed sustainability indicators was consulted upon in summer 2012. As a statutory consultee the Environment Agency were consulted. This matter should have been addressed as part of this consultation.
0054/05/008/Non-specific/C	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>		Comment			The Sustainability Appraisal Framework has not identified any objectives to reduce flood risk- the only relevant objective is to reduce potable water consumption through water harvesting measures.	Sustainability Appraisal should identify objectives to reduce flood risk.	No change	A Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal setting out the proposed sustainability indicators was consulted upon in summer 2012. As a statutory consultee the Environment Agency were consulted. This matter should have been addressed as part of this consultation.

0054/05/010/Non-specific/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object	A policy seeking to protect, enhance and restore the rivers and river corridors of the River Wandle and River Ravensbourne should be included and reference to the Water Framework Directive should be included.	Addition of a policy which protects, enhances and restores the rivers and river corridors of the River Wandle and River Ravensbourne, with a reference to the Water Framework Directive.	No change	The Detailed Policies will not contain a detailed policy on the River Wandle and River Ravensbourne. However, The Detailed Policies now contains a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0054/05/002/Non-specific/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object	No clear audit trail to show how the Strategic Policies have informed the development of the Detailed Policies. The Strategic Policies and the supporting paragraphs are good but have not been taken any further in the Detailed Policies.	Document should show how it has been informed by the Strategic Policies.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0054/05/001/Non-specific/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object	Good intentions set out in Strategic Policies have been lost and concerned that Detailed Policies lack a commitment to achieving Strategic Objective 11, which will contribute positively towards the vision of a place with a sustainable future.	A commitment should be made to achieving Strategic Objective 11.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0054/05/011/Non-specific/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object	Section 4.4.4 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report- there is no position regarding water resources in Croydon. This section should include a position to promote the protection of water resources to bring the document in line with the NPPF.	Should promote the protection of water resources, to be in accordance with the NPPF.	No change	A Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal setting out the proposed sustainability indicators was consulted upon in summer 2012. As a statutory consultee the Environment Agency were consulted. This matter should have been addressed as part of this consultation.

Riddlesdown should be in the Place of Sanderstead, Riddlesdown, is divided by the draft Croydon Local Plan between three Places (Kenley, Purley and Sanderstead) - and a significant chunk of the estate in falls into a triangular hole in the map. I would urge you to revise the Places map to recognise Riddlesdown's unity of character and construction, and its sense of village community, by uniting it within one of the proposed Places, ideally Sanderstead.

Riddlesdown

- * is very much a village with its own character, place name and village signboard;
- * is built on the slopes and top of the local down, which shares the village's name;
- * mostly consists of a single estate that was built and laid out to a unified low-density plan by one developer, John Laing, using a limited and very recognisable number of house styles, mostly detached and semi-detached;
- * has its own residents' association (the Riddlesdown Residents Association), which covers the whole of the estate plus a few neighbouring streets;
- * has its own railway station (Riddlesdown), two local shopping arcades, church and school (Riddlesdown Collegiate) - all originally built to serve the estate;
- * effectively has its own common (the Corporation of London's Riddlesdown Common);
- * has a strong sense of community;
- * forms a well-defined residential enclave mostly surrounded by woodland and open countryside, largely because much of the estate as originally planned was never completed and is now protected green belt.

Add Riddlesdown to the Place of Sanderstead.

Change

The first paragraph in the general character description for Sanderstead reads: Sanderstead is a suburban Place located on a hilltop, with residential areas of Purley Downs, Riddlesdown, Hamsey Green and Sanderstead surrounded by large scale green open spaces such as Mitchley Wood and Kings Wood.

A place that is so clearly unified in its construction, topography, geography and character should at least be granted the dignity of being recognised as a single area, rather than being carved up between three neighbouring Places, with the heart of the village (including its village signboard) missed out altogether.

WHICH PLACE SHOULD RIDDLESDOWN BELONG WITH?

To some extent, it doesn't matter so much which Place it is assigned to. My key concern is that it should certainly not be broken up between three Places, with hole at its heart. However, I believe Riddlesdown falls most naturally into the Sanderstead Place, for the following reasons:

- * the estate, like Sanderstead, is built entirely on the top or the slopes of the downs;
- * the estate falls entirely within the existing boundaries of Sanderstead ward;
- * the residents association representing the whole of the estate, Riddlesdown Residents Association, also falls mostly within Sanderstead ward;
- * the estate's one church, St Edmunds, falls within Sanderstead parish;
- * as the estate was originally built on one large farm, I'm guessing that it's entirely within Sanderstead parish;
- * the estate is entirely dry by local covenants, as is Sanderstead;
- * the estate has the character of a village, like Sanderstead;
- * the estate is entirely separated from the rest of the Kenley Place by common land (Riddlesdown Common - which should perhaps also be assigned to Sanderstead);
- * most of the rest of the estate's boundary (including the undeveloped part) runs up to existing Sanderstead housing.

3. WHICH PARTS OF RIDDLESDOWN FALL INTO THE TRIANGULAR HOLE BETWEEN THE THREE PLACES?

The sections of the Riddlesdown estate that fall into the triangular hole between the proposed Places of Kenley, Purley and Sanderstead are:
 Mitchley Avenue, from the shopping parade to the railway tunnel
 Lower Barn Road, top end (including a small part of Barn Crescent)
 Dalegarth Gardens
 Buttermere Gardens
 Eskdale Gardens, except the top section above Ingleboro Drive
 Derwent Drive, the straight bottom section, and the straight section between the top end and the curving central section
 Grisedale Gardens, the whole of the upper side
 Grisedale Close (a small piece)

The rest is divided between the proposed Places as follows:
 Kenley:
 Honister Heights
 Tops of Derwent Drive & Eskdale Gardens
 Most of Grisedale Close
 Purley
 Coombe Wood Hill
 Bottom of Lower Barn Road, including Rydal Close and most of Barn Crescent
 West end of Mitchley Avenue, up to the railway tunnel
 West end of Ingleboro Drive
 Sanderstead:

East end of Mitchley Avenue, up to shopping parade
 Mitchley Hill
 Dunmail Drive, including Riddlesdown School
 Holmwood Avenue
 Curve of Derwent Drive
 Grisedale Gardens, the whole of the lower side

0092/01/001/Non-specific/O	<i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	Extremely dismayed to note that very little mention is made of Riddlesdown within the proposed Plan and it would appear from various plans published in the proposed document that we are located in a gap between Sanderstead and Purley. Riddlesdown, is a place which has the largest secondary school in the Borough (Riddlesdown Collegiate with 2,000 children plus 250 staff), a railway station, eleven retail frontages on two sites (6 & 5), including a vital sub post office, a chemist, two convenience stores, its own signboard on a Green on Mitchley Ave, a church, a large Common and associated adjoining Green Belt land, arable land and woodland. A large proportion of the Riddlesdown estate is pre-war housing but with post war housing as well. Our community abuts many acres of green belt, woodland, agriculture land/grazing land and also a City of London Common. It is surprising then, that the Council have made very little reference to Riddlesdown's existence! The topography of Riddlesdown, with local infrastructure clearly makes it an important area within the Borough.	We would ask that some reference is made to Riddlesdown within the Plan.	Change	A reference to Riddlesdown has been included in the Places section on Sanderstead in the 'General character'.
0113/11/001/Non-specific/C	<i>Mobile Operators Association</i>	Comment		We have no comments to make in respect of any specific policies within the Local Plan		No change	
0115/01/035/Non-specific/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object		It is difficult to identify policy details in this document and difficult to understand the implication of one set of policies against another, particularly where planning relates to districts outside the central area but there is a buffer zone adjacent to the central area where different policies will be implemented.	Should be able to understanding the implication of one set of policies against another.	Change	Each policy of the Croydon Local Plan has equal weight and must be considered when determining planning applications. Work will be undertaken to ensure that there are no conflicts between policies and that they don't duplicate each other.

0115/01/034/Non-specific/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object		The document, like the previous UDP, is very impenetrable to many residents and the timescale to respond has not allowed for significant consultation or public meetings. There is little confidence that residents will be able to make a representation through their elected councillors which means residents have been disenfranchised from the process.	The timescale should allow for significant consultation or public meetings and residents should be able to make a representation through their elected councillors.	Change	We will try to use plainer English in the text of future drafts of the Croydon Local Plan. Officers of the Spatial Plan service are happy to meet with residents at any stage of the plan-making process and in particular have met with the Addiscombe Planning Forum representing residents of Addiscombe on several occasions including once during the consultation period. Residents are welcome to make comments via their local councillor too and an LDF Member Liaison Group meets during key points during development of the Croydon Local Plan to ensure local councillors views are taken into account before the draft Plan is presented to the Council's Cabinet for approval to consult.
0120/01/180/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment	Soundness - Effective	It is difficult to understand the implication of one set of policies against another, particularly where planning relates to districts outside the central area but there is a buffer zone adjacent to the central area where different policies will be implemented.	Consider ways to demonstrate how policies will work together, and impact, particularly in areas immediately next to Croydon Opportunity Area.	Change	Each policy of the Croydon Local Plan has equal weight and must be considered when determining planning applications. Work will be undertaken to ensure that there are no conflicts between policies and that they don't duplicate each other.
0120/01/009/Non-specific/O	ASPRA	Object		Why does the Council cling to the fallacy that regeneration means building things?	Redefine regeneration.	Change	Consideration has been given to not using the term regeneration in such a way as to imply "building" as it does mean other things too.
0120/01/028/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment		We would like a zebra crossing placed somewhere near St Mildred's Church on Bingham Road, which is currently often dangerous & difficult to cross.	Provide crossing.	No change	This is not a matter that the Croydon Local Plan is able to address as it is not a land use planning issue. However, we will pass the comment on to our colleagues in our Highways service for them to consider.
0120/01/179/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment	Soundness - Effective	It is difficult to identify policy details in this set of documents.		No change	Each policy of the Croydon Local Plan has equal weight and must be considered when determining planning applications. Work will be undertaken to ensure that there are no conflicts between policies and that they don't duplicate each other.

0120/01/178/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment	Legal Compliance	The timescale to respond has not allowed for significant consultation or public meetings.	No change	Officers of the Spatial Plan service are happy to meet with residents at any stage of the plan-making process and in particular have met with the Addiscombe Planning Forum representing residents of Addiscombe on several occasions including once during the consultation period.
0120/01/177/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment	Soundness - Effective	The document, like the previous UDP, is very impenetrable to many residents.	Change	We will try to use plainer English in the text of future drafts of the Croydon Local Plan.
0120/01/181/Non-specific/O	ASPRA	Object	Legal Compliance	The exercise has given us little confidence that residents will be able to make representation through their elected councillors and therefore we have been effectively disenfranchised from the process.	No change	Residents are welcome to make comments via their local councillor too and an LDF Member Liaison Group meets during key points during development of the Croydon Local Plan to ensure local councillors views are taken into account before the draft Plan is presented to the Council's Cabinet for approval to consult.
0122/01/008/Non-specific/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Support		The Plan contains a much greater sympathy, understanding and sensitivity to the needs of the residents and strengthens the case for protecting, conserving and enhancing the surroundings and environment more than previous years. The Plan seems to promise retention and enhancement of what is good and care, quality and appropriateness is considered for new development.	Welcome support	
0122/03/001/Non-specific/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Support		All Policies very good, and yes deliverable and all very reasonable.	Welcome support	
0122/03/002/Non-specific/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Support		All policies very well thought out and considered. Agree the preferred policy approach is sustainable.	Welcome support	
0122/02/009/Non-specific/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Support		The Plan overall has been thoughtfully, professionally, intelligently and sensitively drawn up, especially with regard to retaining architectural environment and heritage and environmental and conservation issues.	Welcome support	

0122/03/007/Non-specific/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	For me, this seems to be a really excellent plan: well considered and well thought through. Combined with the plans for Central Croydon and regeneration schemes, it fills me with optimism for the future of Croydon and surrounding areas. I feel that many people have worked very hard, sensitively and intelligently to bring about the best possible outcomes and am grateful to all concerned.		Welcome support	
0126/01/012/Non-specific/C	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Comment	Like the presentation of the document but further clarity can be provided to improve the reader friendliness of the document.		No change	The comment is noted.
0126/01/008/Non-specific/C	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Comment	More detailed policy provision should be given to ensure an effective and deliverable plan as there is currently insufficient policy direction to ensure planning decisions are consistent with local and national planning guidance and any potential cross-boundary impact on Merton.	Add detailed policy and direction to ensure policy is consistent with local and national planning guidance.	Change	Officers of Croydon Council met with officers of Merton Council to clarify their concerns and discuss them.
0126/01/001/Non-specific/O	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Object	No clear link between the separate sections of the document. Site-specific changes dealt with in the Appendices should also be mentioned in the Policies in the main section of the document. This would improve reader friendliness and provide more clarity up-front on the Council's intended changes for the town centres and other policy areas.	Link the separate sections of the document together by including site-specific changes in the Appendix in the policies in the main section of the document.	No change	This issue will resolve itself at the Proposed Submission stage when a separate Policies Map will be produced. It is not cost effective to prepare a draft Policies Map and the preferred options stage.
0127/01/001/Non-specific/S	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Support	English Heritage is supportive of the Detailed Policies and in general considers these to be well considered and sustainable. We are pleased to note the strong emphasis on the importance of Croydon's built heritage and the role it can play in building a sustainable future and promoting local character. As such we do not wish to comment in detail but can offer the following observations and recommendations.		Welcome support	
0198/01/001/Non-specific/O	Graham Lomas	Object	Sustainability Appraisal is impossible to understand.		Change	A full Sustainability Appraisal will be published at the next stage with a plan English non technical summary.
0089/01/001/Non-specific/C	 <i>The Garden Centre Group</i>	Comment	Shirley Garden Centre and Croydon Garden Centre are considered highly suitable for redevelopment for residential or alternative commercial (food/non-food retail or business) purposes. Their allocation for future development would be entirely consistent with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan.	The Council should allocated both Croydon and Shirley Garden Centres for future development within the Detailed Proposals of the Croydon Local Plan.	No change	The allocation for land for development will be considered as part of the Detailed Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options) to be consulted upon in winter 2015. The site(s) referenced will be considered in the preparation of this document.

10 Transport

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0003/05/012/Non-specific/S	Mr David Hammond Natural England		Support			Supportive of sustainable transport options and these can be linked into soft/permeable landscapes/public, together with providing walking and cycling opportunities along with increasing access to open/green spaces and nature where possible and appropriate.		Welcome support	
0098/01/003/O	Mr Paul Crane		Object	Soundness - Effective		Purley Cross desperately needs altering. Planning should never have been granted to Tesco without major redevelopment of the road system because adding a major superstore on such a busy junction has had a massively negative impact on Purley.		No change	The road network is the responsibility of Transport for London and your comments will be forwarded to the relevant teams at Transport for London as part of the proposed A23 Corridor
0120/01/145/Non-specific/C	ASPRA		Comment			Lack of parking and the introduction of parking restrictions 'killed' the excellent Cherry Orchard Road Shopping Parade. People drove from outside the immediate area to access individual high quality shops (Baker, Farm Butcher, Greengrocer, Shoe Repair shop that also worked for Harrods).		No change	This comment has been noted.

0096/01/001/Purley/O	Mr Andrew Harris	Object	Purley	<p>I see Purley having only two main problems, the Road system / parking</p> <p>As I am sure you are aware we have the Brighton Road with one lane going to Croydon and one lane to Brighton, we have the High Street with one lane to Croydon and we have Whytcliffe Road with one lane to Brighton.</p> <p>Why do you not look at making the Brighton Road one way only to Croydon, with Parking on the LHS of the street 20 free parking, you could then make the High Street one way to Brighton and leave Whytcliffe Road as it is.</p> <p>This would not only create more parking for shoppers, and potentially more income for the council in paid parking, but would allow the traffic to flow better through the town.</p> <p>All this at practically no cost to the council as all the roads could stay as they are.</p> <p>I have spent many years in the town and feel that this system would not only solve some traffic issues, but help small businesses like mine, all I ever here from my customers is that it is hard to park and the multi-story smells of wee !!!!! I would be happy to explain my thoughts if anyone has time for a chat, my contact details are at the bottom of the email.</p>	Add transport management proposals to address issues of traffic and parking in Purley.	No change	The road network is the responsibility of Transport for London and your comments will be forwarded to the relevant teams at Transport for London as part of the proposed A23 Corridor
0097/01/002/Purley/O	Mr Alastair Davis	Object	Purley	Careful consideration also needs to be given to traffic management, which for so long has been poor and mismanaged. The town centre has always needed something to ease traffic and whilst I accept it is not simple better use of the road around Tesco and perhaps a small tunnel from Russell Hill could resolve a lot of issues.	Careful consideration also needs to be given to traffic management in Purley	No change	The road network is the responsibility of Transport for London and your comments will be forwarded to the relevant teams at Transport for London as part of the proposed A23 Corridor
0090/01/002/10.003/C	Mr David Hussey <i>Highways England Company Limit</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	10.003	No further comments on Detailed Policies but may wish to comment on Detailed Proposals when they are consulted upon.	No change	Comment noted.

0119/01/005/10.008/O	Tandridge District Council	Object		10.008	Policy DM24-Paragraph 10.8- It is considered that account needs to be taken of the possible transportation implications of major development proposals on places such as Tandridge District adjoining the London Borough of Croydon.	Policy DM24-Paragraph 10.8- It is considered that account needs to be taken of the possible transportation implications of major development proposals on places such as Tandridge District adjoining the London Borough of Croydon.	No change	DM23 defines the local transport networks that need to be assessed as part of the Transport Assessment. The impact of proposals on adjoining boroughs will be considered as part of the assessment as the Strategic Road Network will be assessed which includes roads within and leading into the borough. The local public transport network is also defined as being bus routes within a 10 minute walk, tram routes and train stations within a 15 minute walk and cycle and walking routes within 15 minutes of the development and will also look at adjoining boroughs.
0026/02/010/10.018/C	Berkeley Homes PLC	Comment		10.018	The text should refer to encouraging passive provision; if the demand for electric car charging points is there from occupiers, then developers will increase provision to satisfy that demand.	Amend paragraph 10.18 to refer to encouraging passive provision.	No change	None - the purpose of the policy is to future-proof residential developments. Requiring necessary infrastructure at the time of development (such as a ring main underneath the parking area) will reduce the costs of installing a charging point for an individual occupier in the future.
0090/01/001/DM24 (Option 1)/C	Mr David Hussey Highways England Company Limit	Comment	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM24 (Option 1)	Concerned if there are any material increase in traffic were to occur on th A23, M23 and M25 to the south as a result of any planned development without careful consideration of impacts and potential mitigation measures.	Careful consideration should be given to the impacts of, and mitigation of, traffic increases affecting the A23, M23 and M25 as a result of planned development.	No change	Comment noted- Council agree that careful consideration of the impacts of development on these roads is required and will work closely with TfL and the Highways Agency.
0092/01/010/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Riddlesdown Residents Associatio	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM24 (Option 1)	The RRA are watching with alarm in our area, the increased on street parking that is occurring principally because of the Council's planning policies. More on street parking is creating huge implications for road safety for both pedestrians, motorists and cyclists.	The Council also need to adopt policies to reduce the amount of commuter parking for many streets close to Riddlesdown Station which is now just about the last Rail and Tram station in the Borough that doesn't have large scale parking restrictions in place.	No change	The Council considers there are methods beyond planning policies, such as Controlled Parking Zones, which are the most appropriate for addressing this issue.
0092/01/009/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Riddlesdown Residents Associatio	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM24 (Option 1)	The RRA are watching with alarm in our area, the increased on street parking that is occurring principally because of the Council's planning policies. More on street parking is creating huge implications for road safety for both pedestrians, motorists and cyclists.	Construction of roads should be a minimum of 7m wide, with at least one, 1m wide pavement.	No change	The suitability of the road network are assessed on a site by site basis through the Development Management process and by the guidance from the Council's Transport team.

0092/01/008/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Riddlesdown Residents Associatio	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM24 (Option 1)	The RRA are watching with alarm in our area, the increased on street parking that is occurring principally because of the Council's planning policies. More on street parking is creating huge implications for road safety for both pedestrians, motorists and cyclists. We believe the Council need to follow policies that other Local Authorities are adopting in respect of increased on-site parking, but in particular Essex County Council, who adopted new parking standards in September 2009.	We believe Croydon ought to follow all of these standards used by Essex CC. We also believe that all new houses, if they have garages, they should be a minimum size of 7m x 3m (internal measurements) and with a minimum 7 foot door opening, to accommodate larger modern day vehicles. Existing garages attached to properties should not be allowed to be demolished and/or converted into residential accommodation, unless the same amount of parking provision is made available within the curtilage of the property to meet the minimum requirements below. Minimum requirements for parking spaces should be 1 space for 1 bed dwellings, 2 spaces for 2+ bedrooms, and 3 spaces for 4+ bedroom dwellings plus minimum visitor parking for flats at 0.25 spaces per dwelling.	No change	These parking standards are in conformity with the London Plan. As Essex County Council is not a London Borough their parking standards are not required to conform with the London Plan. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development and as such minimum parking standards are no longer appropriate.
0093/01/007/DM24 (Option 1)/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment		DM24 (Option 1)	A public transport equivalent of policy DM24 could be considered which would both require development proposals to assess their impact on public transport and safeguard land required for future transport schemes.	New policy similar to DM24, which assesss the impact of development proposals on public transport.	Change	DM24 now requires development proposals to assess their impact on local transport networks which covers both the local road and public transport network.
0093/01/005/DM24 (Option 1)/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment		DM24 (Option 1)	Relation to public transport impact: It may be that the Council takes the view that the London Plan policy 6.3 provides adequate protection and if this is the case, it should be stated explicitly.	Document should state that London Plan policy 6.3 is sufficient.	Change	DM24 now requires development proposals to assess their impact on local transport networks which covers both the local road and public transport network.
0093/01/016/DM24 (Option 1)/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment		DM24 (Option 1)	Question whether there should be a specific mention of freight within this policy to ensure that individual development sites consider how deliveries to the site can be safely and efficiently managed.	Reference to be made to freight in this policy.	No change	No change as it is considered that SP8.19 and the proposed change to paragraph 10.8 will address this point.
0093/01/014/DM24 (Option 1)/S	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Support		DM24 (Option 1)	Supports the aims set out in the preferred option, which is consistent with London Plan policy 6.1. Would be happy to work with the council to deliver these objectives.		Welcome support	
0093/01/004/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Object		DM24 (Option 1)	Noticeable that this chapter only considers highway impacts. Whilst strategic policy SP8 contains a number of elements designed to protect public transport infrastructure, there is no policy in either document which requires individual developments to assess their impact on public transport capacity.	Policy should require individual developments to assess their impact on public transport capacity.	Change	DM24 now requires development proposals to assess their impact on local transport networks which covers both the local road and public transport network.
0098/01/001/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Mr Paul Crane	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM24 (Option 1)	Infrastructure and facilities in the area are struggling to cope with the existing density of housing and population.	Road congestion in the Riddlesdown/Purley area should be tackled before new homes are developed.	No change	Comment is noted.
0099/02/025/DM24 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM24 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	

0101/01/016/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden Shirley Planning Forum	Object	Soundness - Effective DM24 (Option 1)	New development should not be allowed to commence before developers have demonstrated to the Council that full and legal access to all parts of the development is unrestricted. Access to a site by a parallel road, which could be construed to be a dual carriageway is confusing and should be avoided (ref: 12/02760/P)	This should be a condition placed on any approved development	No change	The comments received relate to a particular application. The issue of demonstrating that access to a development site is legal and unrestricted is a civil matter and not a matter of planning consideration. DM24 addresses highway safety but can only address issues of access directly onto the public highway. Whilst it might be desirable for developers to share private access an application cannot be refused if they don't. A policy cannot require developers to do something which may render acceptable development (in terms of highway safety) to be undeliverable.
0105/01/046/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM24 (Option 1)	<p>Agree the preferred policy is the appropriate for Croydon but requires additional NPPF statements. NPPF 4. Promoting sustainable transport page 9 includes: Para 32. States All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure; • safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and •Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. <p>First bullet point : All Design and Access Statements should contain a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment Plan. Any proposed development without such information should be rejected.</p> <p>Second bullet: In order to meet the "safe and suitable access" development proposals should not propose access to a site by provision of a parallel road with an existing access roadway which could be confusing to motorist as it could be construed as a dual carriageway. (see planning application Reference: 12/02760/P)</p>	<p>Ammend policy to include: All Design and Access Statements should contain a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment Plan. Any proposed development without such information should be rejected. In order to meet the "safe and suitable access" development proposals should not propose access to a site by provision of a parallel road with an existing access roadway which could be confusing to motorist as it could be construed as a dual carriageway.</p>	No change	An application cannot be refused on the grounds that a transport statement or transport assessment has not been submitted. However, major development proposals, as part of the application process, will be required to demonstrate how they will promote measures to increase the use of public transport, cycling and walking and that they will not result in a severe impact on the local road network and public transport network.

0105/01/047/DM24
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM24 (Option 1)

Agree the preferred policy is the appropriate for Croydon but requires additional NPPF statements. NPPF 4. Promoting sustainable transport page 9 includes:
Para 32. States
All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment.
Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

First bullet point :
All Design and Access Statements should contain a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment Plan.
Any proposed development without such information should be rejected.

Ammend policy to include:
All Design and Access Statements should contain a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment Plan.
Any proposed development without such information should be rejected.
In order to meet the "safe and suitable access" development proposals should not propose access to a site by provision of a parallel road with an existing access roadway which could be confusing to motorist as it could be construed as a dual carriageway.

No change

An application cannot be refused on the grounds that a transport statement or transport assessment has not been submitted.
However, major development proposals, as part of the application process, will be required to demonstrate how they will promote measures to increase the use of public transport, cycling and walking and that they will not result in a severe impact on the local road network and public transport network. In addition, The comments received relate to a particular application. The issue of demonstrating that access to a development site is legal and unrestricted is a civil matter and not a matter of planning consideration. DM24 addresses highway safety but can only address issues of access directly onto the public highway. Whilst it might be desirable for developers to share private access an application cannot be refused if they don't. A policy cannot require developers to do something which may render acceptable development (in terms of highway safety) to be undeliverable.

0105/01/048/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM24 (Option 1)	<p>Agree the preferred policy is the appropriate for Croydon but requires additional NPPF statements. NPPF 4. Promoting sustainable transport page 9 includes: Para 32. States All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure; • safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and • Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. <p>Second bullet: In order to meet the safe and suitable access development proposals should not propose access to a site by provision of a parallel road with an existing access roadway which could be confusing to motorist as it could be construed as a dual carriageway. (see planning application Reference: 12/02760/P)</p>	<p>Ammend policy to include: All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure; • safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and • Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. 	No change	Paragraph 10.8 of policy DM24 and Strategic Policy SP8.4 require major development proposals to be supported by transport assessments, travel plans, construction logistics plans and delivery/servicing plans.
0125/01/003/DM24 (Option 1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM24 (Option 1)	This Policy Option1 does not enable sustainable development. Reducing car use and congestion relies on encouraging people to cycle. This involves making every aspect of the journey as attractive as possible. This starting point for many journeys will not be attractive if a resident needs to walk a long way (perhaps even past their car) to get to their bike and then struggle to get it out of the rack, assuming that security is good enough to have felt confident to leave it there in the first place.	Amend Policy DM24 Option1 to be more sustainable- to reduce car use and encourage people to cycle.	No change	Since the Detailed Policies were consulted on the Further Alterations to the London Plan have been published. These contain new cycle parking standards which the Council believe will provide high standards of cycle parking provision.
0125/01/002/DM24 (Option 1)/C	Mr Tim Gould	Comment	DM24 (Option 1)	This policy Option1 is easily deliverable because, without additional guidance, it sets such a very low benchmark for cycle parking facilities.		No change	Comment noted.

0125/01/001/DM24
(Option 1)/O

Mr Tim Gould

Object

DM24 (Option 1)

Policy DM24 Option 1 is not the most appropriate for Croydon. Taken on face value the London Plan requirement of 'secure, integrated and accessible cycle parking facilities' should be adequate. However, experience shows that, without explicit guidance on how to meet these standards, developers will design the lowest quality provision they can get away with. Guidance should include matters such as:

Security comes from both the style of stand and the location and attributes of the cycle store. Stands should allow the locking of the frame and rear wheel to something solid with a single shackle lock (the style of lock preferred by most cyclists). Stores should be lockable (except for short-term visitor parking) and have a degree of natural or formal surveillance.

Integrated relates to the location and attributes of the store. Stores should be covered (again, except for visitor parking) and have direct and convenient access to both the street and to the development. It is not acceptable to make cyclists walk around the building to a main entrance after locking their bike at the rear. Similarly, cyclists should not have to wheel bikes along corridors, around corners, etc. within the building. Cyclists should never have to take a bike through a residential unit.

Accessible relates to the location of the store (detailed above), the layout of stands within the store, and to the style of stand. Stands should be laid out with generous aisle widths and turning spaces to ensure that all stands are accessible without the need to lift bikes. The style of stand should be accessible to all regardless of physical strength or dexterity. Therefore they should not require lifting or any technique. They should be suitable for all types of bike (i.e. including children's bikes for residential developments).

Amend DM24, Option1. to include guidance for ensuring high quality of provision for cyclists.

No change

Since the Detailed Policies were consulted on the Further Alterations to the London Plan have been published. These contain new cycle parking standards which the Council believe will provide high standards of cycle parking provision.

0130/01/023/DM24 (Option 1)/O	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Object		DM24 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM24 relates to highway safety and the need to reduce congestion within the Borough. Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') requires developments to promote measures to increase the use of public transport, cycling and walking; have a positive impact and not a detrimental impact on highway safety for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport uses and private vehicles; and not result in a severe impact on the local road network. Whilst we agree with the principle of what the Council is trying to achieve through the preparation of this policy, it is considered that, as drafted, the policy will not always be practically achievable if Croydon's growth potential is to be realised. Instead, it is suggested that the introduction to this policy (i.e. before the criteria is listed) is revised to read: 'To promote sustainable growth in Croydon, development proposals should seek to minimise the impact of traffic congestions by:'	Amend Policy 24 Option 1 - It is suggested that the introduction to this policy (i.e. before the criteria is listed) is revised to read: 'To promote sustainable growth in Croydon, development proposals should seek to minimise the impact of traffic congestions by:'	No change	The Council believes it is possible to reduce the impact of congestion whilst also achieving Croydon's growth potential. This will be done through measures set out in SP8 and DM24.
0093/01/015/10.008/C	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>	Comment		10.008	For the avoidance of doubt this paragraph could refer to travel plans, construction logistics plans and delivery and servicing plans in addition to transport assessment plans, as ways in which major developments will be required to show how highway impacts will be minimised.	Paragraph make reference to travel plans, construction logistic plans and servicing plans.	Change	Paragraph 10.8 will also make reference to travel plans, construction logistic plans and delivery & servicing plans.
0026/02/006/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Berkeley Homes PLC</i>	Object	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM25 (Option 1)	A blanket requirement as set out in DM25 Option1 (e) may not be appropriate as income disparities and car ownership levels will often be lower in affordable tenures and the provision of parking would be better applied on a site by site basis for affordable housing..	Amend DM25 Option1 to allow provision of parking on a site by site basis for affordable housing.	No change	None - The Council recognises that car ownership levels can be lower in affordable housing schemes and it is for this reason that the policy sets the parking provision rate at two thirds of the rate of other tenures. Determining parking provision on a site by site is unlikely to be effective as it is not until occupation of the units that actual car parking requirements are known.
0093/01/018/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>	Object		DM25 (Option 1)	The standards relating to electric vehicle charging points may differ from those set out in the London Plan. All uses should provide both active and passive provision in line with London Plan table 6.2, although there is support the proposals to ensure that all parking spaces within larger residential development sites have passive provision for future charging points.	Ensure policy is in line with London Plan table 6.2	No change	The standards will ensure that all parking provision for residential development has passive provision for electric cars which goes further than the 20% in the London Plan.

0093/01/017/DM25 (Option 1)/S	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>	Support		DM25 (Option 1)	Support of Croydon's commitment to car clubs through this policy but would recommend that liaison takes place with CarPlus, the car club industry body to ensure they can respond positively to any new planning requirements.		Welcome support	Welcome support and agree that it is necessary for officers to undertake this liaison with CarPlus.
0099/02/026/DM25 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM25 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	
0101/01/017/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM25 (Option 1)	Many areas of Shirley are low public transport accessible localities and are likely to remain so. The reduction of off street parking and attempts to force residents to use public transport are flawed as residents will still use their cars and will park their vehicles in the roadway if sufficient off road parking is not available and avoidable congestion results.	The NPPF is more practical and gives more flexibility. Local authorities should take account of: - The accessibility of the development - The type, mix and use of development - The availability of and opportunities for public transport - Local car ownership levels - An overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles	No change	This policy has been drafted to be compliant with both the NPPF, the London Plan and Strategic Policy SP8.17.

0105/01/049/DM25
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM25 (Option 1)

The Option1 is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objective set out in Section 3 and is not deliverable. Reasons- Area not included. Realistically the reduction of off street parking to try to force residents to use public transport is flawed as if public transport remains poor in low PTAL areas, as it is in some parts of The Shirley Place and Monks Orchard, residents will still use their own cars and if no residential off street parking is available, they will park their vehicles in the roadway as near to their property as they can. This results in increased congestion due to the take up of road space and some double parking which reduces the carriageway to one vehicle width. The council is referred to the London Plan requirements. For car parking provision per 4,3 and 1-2 bed units, and it states 'All developments in areas of good public transport accessibility and/or town centres should aim for less than 1 space per unit. The needs of disabled residents will need to be taken into account in developments with low car parking provision, so that adequate spaces, either on site or convenient on-street spaces, are identified for occupants.'

The NPPF seems more sensible as it gives more flexibility see: Para 39. If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the accessibility of the development;
- the type, mix and use of development;
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- local car ownership levels; and
- an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles

The policy should have regard to paragraph 39 of the NPPF with offers more flexibility. The needs of disabled residents will need to be taken into account in developments with low car parking provision, so that adequate spaces, either on site or convenient dedicated on-street spaces, are identified for occupants.

No change

The Mayor's Housing SPG set out the requirements of car parking spaces to be capable of extensions to accommodate disabled parking should it be required. In addition, applications can be made for on-street disabled parking bays.

0115/01/023/DM25
(Option 1)/O

Mr Bob Sleeman

Object

DM25 (Option 1)

The policy is deliverable for new builds but does not consider existing housing stock or transport hubs so these will continue to be a problem.

Policy should consider existing housing stock and transport hubs.

No change

DM25 concerns both new build and conversions and therefore parking standards must accord with the London Plan, as well as the Strategic Policies SP8.15 to SP8.17. The existing housing stock has been a consideration in both the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies.

0115/01/021/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	The policy will meet the strategic objectives at a cost to the community. The lack of car parking spaces in Addiscombe when larger older properties are converted blocks roads and junctions and makes it difficult for service vehicles to gain access. The infrastructure therefore deteriorates and there is a build-up of rubbish.	Parking issues need to be addressed.	No change	The Council considers there are methods beyond planning policies, such as Controlled Parking Zones, which are the most appropriate for addressing this issue.
0115/01/024/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	This policy is sustainable for new builds as the social stigma attached to car ownership increases by 2050.	Policy needs to address existing housing stock.		DM25 concerns both new build and conversions and therefore parking standards must accord with the London Plan, as well as the Strategic Policies SP8.15 to SP8.17. The existing housing stock has been a consideration in both the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies.
0115/01/022/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	Trams have improved transport and reduced the need for cars but little thought has been given to commuter car parking near Sandilands and Addiscombe tram stops and this policy makes no mention of the need for car parking facilities near to the transport hubs.	Parking issues at transport hubs need to be addressed.	No change	The Council considers there are methods beyond planning policies, such as Controlled Parking Zones, which are the most appropriate for addressing this issue.
0118/07/001/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	The requirement for 5% of spaces with a minimum of 1 parking space to provide on-site car club/pool car parking spaces on sites over dwellings is overly prescriptive. The policy objective to provide an allocation whilst having regard to specific site circumstances would be a better approach to achieving this aspiration to provide scope for negotiation and regard to on-site parking considerations.	Amend the requirements for car club/pool car parking spaces to have regard to site specific circumstances.	No change	This requirement provides clarity for developers. The Development Management process allows for specific site circumstances to be taken into account.
0118/07/004/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	Amend the requirements for car club/pool car parking spaces to have regard to site specific circumstances.	Change	Changes have been made to DM25 which mean in circumstances where a car club may be provided in a location that is commercially unviable, developers will be required to work with a car club operator to find a suitable location from which they would operate.
0118/07/002/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	DM25: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	Amend the requirements for car club/pool car parking spaces to have regard to site specific circumstances.	Change	Changes have been made to DM25 which mean in circumstances where a car club may be provided in a location that is commercially unviable developers will be required to work with a car club operator to find a suitable location from which they would operate.

0120/01/144/DM25 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	Trams have improved transport and reduced the need for cars but little though was given to the resultant commuter parking near Sandilands and Addiscombe tram stops. The policy makes no mention of the need for car parking facilities near to the transport hubs.	The policy should mention the need for car parking facilities near to the transport hubs.	No change	The Council considers there are methods beyond planning policies, such as Controlled Parking Zones, which are the most appropriate for addressing this issue.
0120/01/143/DM25 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The planning for car parking is part of the overall London dilemma. As far as it impacts 'Addiscombe' the lack of car parking space, when large older property is converted into multiple flats, blocks roads and junctions and makes it difficult for service vehicles (e.g. street cleaning, gully cleaning) to gain access. The infrastructure therefore deteriorates and there is a general build-up of rubbish. Of course we will meet the objectives of this policy at a cost to the community."		No change	DM25 concerns both new build and conversions and therefore parking standards must accord with the London Plan, as well as the Strategic Policies SP8.15 and SP8.17. The existing housing has been a consideration in both the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies.
0120/01/148/DM25 (Option 1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM25 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach enables sustainable development. Sustainable for new-builds as the social stigma attached to car ownership increases by 2050.		Welcome support	
0120/01/146/DM25 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	DM25 Option1 will be deliverable where new-builds are concerned. It does not make any statement about existing housing stock or transport hubs, so these will continue to be a problem but not addressed by this policy.	The policy should address the need for car parking facilities near to the transport hubs.	No change	The Council considers there are methods beyond planning policies, such as Controlled Parking Zones, which are the most appropriate for addressing this issue.
0121/01/025/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	Some minimum standards for parking provision in public facilities like hospitals, surgeries etc. would be welcome. (lessons learnt from supermarkets who succeed because of ample parking).	Provide minimum standards for parking provision in public facilities like hospitals, surgeries etc in the Parking Policy DM25.	No change	Currently, there are no adopted parking standards either within the London Plan or Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies for D1 use classes (for which hospitals and surgeries fall within). The NPPF provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development and as such minimum parking standards are no longer appropriate. All development proposals falling under a D1 use are judged upon their own merits and operational requirements in order to determine an appropriate level of off-street parking provision.

0125/01/006/DM25 (Option 1)/C	Mr Tim Gould	Comment	DM25 (Option 1)	Yes, the policy is deliverable, developers will happily provide a lower level of car parking for affordable homes, since it will reduce their costs.		No change	Comment noted.
0125/01/007/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	No, the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development. The sale of spaces provides a perverse incentive to keep a car and thus the marginal cost of car trips is small providing little incentive to use sustainable modes of transport.	Amend Policy DM25 to enable sustainable development.	No change	The Council does not believe this change would address the "perverse incentive" referred to as the person who leases the space is unlikely to end their lease and would probably sub-let the space if they no longer needed it.
0125/01/010/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	No, the preferred policy approach will not enable sustainable development. The overprovision of car parking in locations with good public transport (for which the presence of a CPZ is a good indicator) is an inefficient use of land. The provision of expensive on-site car parking can affect viability and therefore lead to a reduced provision of affordable housing or the meeting of other objectives.	Amend Policy DM25 to enable sustainable development.	No change	The provision of car parking spaces is in conformity with the London Plan and the Council does not consider this to be an over-provision of spaces.
0125/01/005/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	Policy DM25(e)- No , it is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. Reason -Regarding the proportion of spaces allocated to residents of affordable housing, evidence should extend to the need for a vehicle for access to work and for work purposes, not just average car ownership.	Amend or replace DM25(e).	No change	This would place an unrealistic burden on developers as it is highly unlikely that developers would be able to determine the need for spaces from prospective occupiers.
0125/01/009/DM25 (Option 1)/S	Mr Tim Gould	Support	DM25 (Option 1)	Yes the policy is deliverable.		Welcome support	
0125/01/004/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	Policy DM25(e)- No , it is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. Reason - This implies that car parking spaces in a mixed-tenure development will be allocated in different proportions to different tenures. Developers should be encouraged or even required to lease the spaces to residents, rather than sell them. This removes any perverse incentive to retain a car (i.e. to fill a resident's own parking space) when it is not being used, and provides a degree of churn that is likely to make spaces available for those whose circumstances change such that they need to keep a vehicle.	Amend or replace DM25(e).	No change	The Council does not believe this change would address the "perverse incentive" referred to as the person who leases the space is unlikely to end their lease and would probably sub-let the space if they no longer needed it.

0125/01/008/DM25 (Option 1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	No, the policy is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3 . The policy should explicitly encourage car-free developments (except for disabled parking and access to a car-club car) where the potential overspill parking can be controlled, i.e. by making the development "permit-free" within a Controlled Parking Zone.	Amend Policy DM25 Option 1 to explicitly encourage car-free developments (except for disabled parking and access to a car-club car) where the potential overspill parking can be controlled, i.e. by making the development "permit-free" within a Controlled Parking Zone.	No change	This is done in SP8.15 of the Strategic Policies which encourages car free development in centres where there are high levels of public transport accessibility and where the critical mass of development enables viable alternatives, such as car clubs.
0128/01/011/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	The policy is counter to strategic objective 9 in that it would result in an inefficient use of space which would run counter to the objectives of sustainable development.	Amend policy to ensure does not result in inefficient use of space.	No change	This policy is informed by the London Plan and these parking requirements are not considered to promote the inefficient use of space.
0128/01/012/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	Do not consider the policy to be able to deliver sustainable development.	Ensure policy can deliver sustainable development.	No change	The Council considers this policy does promote sustainable growth.
0128/01/014/DM25 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 1)	The policy does not encourage sustainable economic development.	Ensure policy can deliver sustainable development.	No change	The Council does not share this view.
0026/02/009/10.018/O	<i>Berkeley Homes PLC</i>	Object	10.018	The paragraph 10.18 proposal is over and above the requirements of the London Plan policy 6.3 and fails paragraph 182 of NPPF London Plan Policy 6.13 requires 20% of all residential parking to have active electric charging points, with an additional 20% to have passive provision for electric vehicles in the future. Supporting paragraph 10.18 states that 'all spaces in residential developments need to be enabled for future use by electric cars by ensuring the necessary infrastructure with the exception of actual charging points is integrated from the start' - this requirement for complete passive provision goes over and above that set out in the London Plan and should be removed. The tests of soundness set out in Paragraph 182 of the NPPF aim to ensure that plans are consistent with national and strategic policy.	Amend Paragraph 10.18 to remove requirement for complete passive provision.	No change	None - Requiring necessary infrastructure at the time of development (such as a ring main underneath the parking area) will reduce the costs of installing charging points at a later date. Without this relatively modest additional cost to the developer, it is possible that the subsequent cost to an individual occupier in the future will prove to be a deterrent to using an electric vehicle.
0128/01/015/DM25 (Option 2)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 2)	The policy does not encourage sustainable economic development.	Ensure policy can deliver sustainable development.	No change	The Council does not share this view.
0128/01/016/DM25 (Option 2)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Option 2)	This option relies on Policy SP8 of the Strategic Policies but this policy states that parking standards for the borough will be identified in the Detailed Policies, therefore a link back to SP8 would be unclear in this option.	This option cannot rely on SP8, which states that parking standards will be dealt with in the Detailed Policies.	No change	The alternative option considers whether additional parking standards are required.

0125/01/011/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	<p>Re- Option1 DM25(d)- The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. for the following reasons- Disabled parking 1</p> <p>Table 1 implies that spaces should be assigned to wheelchair-accessible units. There will be some residents of such units who do not drive, and therefore the parking space will be built but potentially unused. There will be some residents who become disabled during their occupation 'Lifetime homes' and require a disabled parking space but are not wheelchair users and so don't need to move into a wheelchair-accessible unit. Therefore disabled parking should be provided at the rate required but not assigned to individual units, with allocation on the basis of need and monitored through an on-going obligation.</p> <p>The alternative of providing dedicated on-street disabled parking is not an appropriate solution, since there will be many places in which this will either compromise road safety or the space cannot be provided in a location convenient (i.e. easily accessible to) the disabled resident.</p>	Amend Table 10.1 to include disabled parking provided at the rate required but not assigned to individual units, with allocation on the basis of need and monitored through an on-going obligation.	No change	A system of monitoring through an "on-going obligation" to disabled parking is unlikely to be workable and does not provide clarity to developers. Table 10.1 does not assign disabled car parking spaces to individual units.
0125/01/015/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	<p>The policy is not deliverable. On-site disabled parking and car-club spaces are often difficult to provide as set out below-</p> <p>My experience from working with car-club providers in Central London is that they prefer to have dedicated spaces on-street. If placed within a development the car will not be available to the wider community, which can otherwise be a positive benefit for the community arising from the new development and has been proven to reduce parking stress. Additionally, the quantum of car club spaces should be determined by reference to car club operators rather than based on a formula, and my experience is that 5% of general spaces provided will be far too high.</p>	Amend Policy DM25- car clubs should not be within the development. Numbers should be determined by reference to car club operators..	Change	Changes have been made to DM25 which mean in circumstances where a car club may be provided in a location that is commercially unviable, developers will be required to work with a car club operator to find a suitable location from which they wish to operate. Developers will be expected to then fund an on-street parking bay.

0125/01/012/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Re- Option1 DM25(d)- The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. for the following reasons- Disabled parking 2 There will be some small 'major' developments where provision of disabled parking is very difficult, for example it may compromise road safety, efficient use of the land and potentially a number of other aspects of good design. It also provides a perverse incentive to reduce the number of units to below 10, leading to further inefficiencies in the use of land. Instead, appropriate commuted-sums should be accepted so that wheelchair-accessible units can be provided off-site in the same way that affordable housing is, thus removing the requirement for on-site disabled parking provision.	Amend Policy DM25 Table 10.1 to recognise small 'major' developments where disabled parking is difficult.	No change	This policy is in conformity with the London Plan and the Council does not consider there are sufficient grounds for it to take a different view on this matter.
0125/01/013/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Re- Option1 DM25(d)- The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. for the following reasons- Disabled parking Reason3 The policy is worded such that a minimum 1 space is required for visitor on top of the one space per wheelchair-accessible unit. Visitor parking for disabled drivers can be accommodated on-street (using the blue badge system) with no requirement for specific action. Otherwise this policy is onerous on developers, particularly for small 'major' developments as in my point above.	Amend Policy DM25 Table 10.1 to acknowledge that Visitor parking for disabled can be provided on-street.	No change	It is important for off-street disabled parking to be provided.
0125/01/016/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development. Requiring provision of on-site parking spaces can lead to inefficient use of land, and could lead to compromises in road safety.	Amend Policy DM25 Table 10.1 to enable sustainable development.- omit onsite parking space provision.	No change	This policy is in conformity with the London Plan and the Council does not consider there are sufficient grounds for it to take a different view on this matter.

0125/01/014/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	Mr Tim Gould	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Re- Option1 DM25(d)- The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help meet the Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. for the following reasons- Car-club spaces My experience from working with car-club providers in Central London is that they prefer to have dedicated spaces on-street. If placed within a development the car will not be available to the wider community, which can otherwise be a positive benefit for the community arising from the new development and has been proven to reduce parking stress. Additionally, the quantum of car club spaces should be determined by reference to car club operators rather than based on a formula, and my experience is that 5% of general spaces provided will be far too high.	Amend Policy DM25- car clubs should not be within the development. Numbers should be determined by reference to car club operators.	Change	Changes have been made to DM25 which mean in circumstances where a car club may be provided in a location that is commercially unviable developers will be required to work with a car club operator to find a suitable location from which they would operate. Developers will be expected to then fund on-street parking bay.
0128/01/017/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Agree with the approach to make reference to the London Plan in regard to parking numbers and disabled parking numbers but should be caveated in some way to allow for an update to the London Plan policy and in particular the table referenced by the Mayor.	Policy should allow for an update to the policy in the London Plan and the associated table.	No change	If the London Plan is revised and this policy/table is no longer in conformity, this revision would be taken into account during the planning application stage. This principle applies throughout the document.
0128/01/018/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Do not agree it is appropriate to provide on-site car club/pool car parking spaces within non-residential development. There is no information about how this system would work or be monitored for non-residential development. It is considered that this approach would result in the need to develop spaces that are not likely to be used and therefore be an inefficient use of land.	Include information about how system would work and how it would be monitored.	Change	Changes have been made to DM25 which mean in circumstances where a car club may be provided in a location that is commercially unviable developers will be required to work with a car club operator to find a suitable location from which they would operate. Developers will be expected to then fund on-street parking bay.
0130/01/024/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Draft Policy DM25 sets out criteria that new "residential" development must meet in terms of car parking provision with the aim of promoting sustainable growth in the Borough. Criterion D of draft Policy DM25 refers to Table 10.1 of the consultation document which sets out car parking standards to be adhered to, for both residential and non-residential development. We would be grateful if the Council could confirm that draft Policy DM25 refers to both residential and non-residential development as per Table 10.1.	Council should confirm if Policy DM25 refers to both residential and non-residential development as per Table 10.1.	No change	To clarify that the policy relates to both residential and non-residential development, the wording of the policy has been changed to "To promote sustainable growth in Croydon and reduce the impact of car parking new development must."

0130/01/025/DM25 (Table 10.1)/O	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Object	DM25 (Table 10.1)	Table 10.1 either directly makes reference to the London Plan standards, or provides standards in accordance with the London Plan standards. We agree with the principle of referring to the London Plan standards, however we strongly urge the Council to, if looking to formerly adopt draft Policy DM25 in due course, make reference to the Croydon OAPF. The OAPF (in Chapter 8) specifically considers parking scenarios for the Retail Core and wider CMC in detail and should therefore be referred to in Policy DM25.	Make reference to the Croydon OAPF in Table 10.1, if looking to formerly adopt draft Policy DM25 Option1.	No change	Whilst the Opportunity Area Planning Framework provides different scenarios for the Opportunity Area and the Retail Core it does not provide detailed parking standards. No further reference to the OAPF will be made in this policy.
0093/01/019/DM26 (Option 1)/S	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>	Support	DM26 (Option 1)	Support the preferred option for this policy to ensure that car parking within the borough can be controlled and managed and does not undermine public transport, walking and cycling.		Welcome support	
0121/01/026/DM26 (Option 2)/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support	DM26 (Option 2)	Prefer Option 2 as it allows for better use of empty space on a temporary basis (need to be managed properly so it does not become an eyesore or otherwise dangerous).	Select Option2 , Policy DM26 as the preferred approach.	Welcome support	Support for DM26 Option 2 has been noted.

11 The Places of Croydon

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0051/02/001//S	Edward Moody <i>Minerva</i>		Support			The policy is in line with the requirements of NPPF and supports the vitality and viability of the Metropolitan, District and Local centres to provide a mixed use focus for communities in accessible locations across the borough.		Welcome support	Thank you for your support.
0054/05/006//C	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>		Comment			Critical Drainage Areas identified by the Croydon Surface Water Management Plan feature in the places of Croydon: Croydon Opportunity Area, Kenley, Old Coulsdon, Purley and South Croydon. There is no consideration to reducing flood risk.	Consideration to be made to reduce flood risk in the critical drainage areas of Croydon Opportunity Area, Kenley, Old Coulsdon, Purley and South Croydon.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0105/01/054/Non-specific/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>		Object			Add a new policy to DM38 for the Shirley Place as follows Policy DM38.5:Reference, respect and enhance the character and architectural features such as the roofscapes and building heights of residential properties within Monks Orchard and to maintain the variety of roof heights and garden sizes within this area. Maintain the variety of types and garden sizes to support the increasing demand for private properties and amenities suitable for a full range of ages.	Add a new policy to DM38 for the Shirley Place as follows Policy DM38.5:Reference, respect and enhance the character and architectural features such as the roofscapes and building heights of residential properties within Monks Orchard and to maintain the variety of roof heights and garden sizes within this area. Maintain the variety of types and garden sizes to support the increasing demand for private properties and amenities suitable for a full range of ages.	No change	The character of Monks Orchard is highly consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7).
0105/01/056/Non-specific/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>		Object			Add new paragraph with title 'Monks Orchard Area' and text as follows- The character of Monks Orchard is dominated by variety of house and garden sizes, green verges, tree lined streets with and open views and skylines created by imaginative roofscapes and a variety of types of buildings such as two/three storey and single stories. In this area the potential for growth is limited.	Add new paragraph with title 'Monks Orchard Area' and text as follows- The character of Monks Orchard is dominated by variety of house and garden sizes, green verges, tree lined streets with and open views and skylines created by imaginative roofscapes and a variety of types of buildings such as two/three storey and single stories. In this area the potential for growth is limited.	No change	The character of Monks Orchard is highly consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). Therefore no additional wording is required.
0120/01/132/Non-specific/C	<i>ASPRA</i>		Comment			With reference to the 'Areas' of Croydon appear to be selected for reasons other than planning. This planning exercise appears to be political rather than practical as it fails to engage with the residents. For example in the ASPRA area I have seen only a single response from a resident, who was clearly confused by the whole process.	Comment, no proposed change.	No change	The comment is noted and the Council is disappointed that ASPRA feels this way. It will work with ASPRA on how to engage with local residents in future.

0120/01/133/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment	The Residents' Associations are trying to work together to a tight deadline, but are in danger of failing to discuss and reflect resident's views.	Change	The six week formal consultation period provides a focus for the Council to publicise its preferred planning policies. The Council will continue to work with the community on the content of Croydon Local Plan as it prepares the Proposed Submission draft. This second point will be made clearer in future consultations on preferred planning policies and proposals.	
0120/01/134/Non-specific/C	ASPRA	Comment	Ward Councillors appear to have been excluded from meetings, but they are the democratically elected representatives.	No change	Ward councillors have not been excluded from any meeting. Officers of the Spatial Planning service met with the Addiscombe Planning Forum who could have invited their local representatives. In addition throughout the process of drafting the preferred policies internal Member Liaison Group meetings have been held to which an Addiscombe councillor has always been invited.	
0120/01/142/Non-specific/O	ASPRA	Object	As these are not natural or current administrative 'areas' they cannot engage with the residents who are thereby forced into such planning blocks. They do not have clear physical or social boundaries and there is little to engender 'belonging'. They will fail because the residents cannot identify with such large 'areas'.	Review and amend the Places' boundaries.	No change	The general concept and broad areas of the Places were originally set out and subject to public consultation as part of the preparation of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. Tweaks to boundaries are possible as part of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies but not the concept itself as the Detailed Policies legally have to be in conformity with the Strategic Policies.

0120/01/166/Non-specific/O

ASPRA

Object

The logic behind the choice of areas for place-specific policies is not clear to us e.g 29.2. It seems more important to have specific policies to protect areas that have not yet deteriorated but retain unity of architectural and functional character.

Question logic of the Place specific policies concentrating on those areas that are not consistent- should concentrate policies on the areas that have not yet deteriorated and that are consistent. (This repeats comment No. 129)

Change

The areas of consistent character are sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In case of deteriorated character, more specific guidance needs to be provided.

For clarity Paragraph 11.6 will be rephrased to read: 'In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included.'

0120/01/131//O

ASPRA

Object

The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. Reasons:-The 'Areas' of Croydon appear to have been selected for reasons other than planning. Specifically 'Addiscombe' comprises a wide mix housing types, population density, character and age of properties, mix of council and private dwellings and schools, open spaces and community centres e.g. churches. However the area is far too large to have any practical mechanism for public consultation afforded by ward boundaries or Residents' Associations.

Would like 16 Places reviewed.

No change

The general concept and broad areas of the Places were originally set out and subject to public consultation as part of the preparation of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. Tweaks to boundaries are possible as part of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies but not the concept itself as the Detailed Policies legally have to be in conformity with the Strategic Policies.

0126/01/006/Non-specific/O	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Object	The policies are vague and it is difficult to see which areas are intended to grow in Croydon. The strategic policies for a number of areas in the borough, particularly around existing centres, generally reflect a "high level" policy policy and do not include site specific development criteria.	Include site-specific development criteria.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. The new development should positively respond to the existing character, as per general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included. National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses are provided through Call for Sites' procedure which will be re-launched in February 2014
0126/01/010/Non-specific/C	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Comment	Cannot determine potential cross-boundary impacts of development as there is no certainty what future uses may be proposed on the sites. More information is required for the site allocation policies to set out clearly what is and is not permitted within the allocated areas, subject to an appropriate evidence base. Could be addressed by linking all the areas to the relevant policies to accommodate growth or by indicating that these issues will be dealt with further in Area Action Plans, SPDs or Masterplans. Look forward to seeing further information regarding Place-Specific development management policies.	Add further information to set out what development is and what is not permitted within the allocated areas.	No change	The forthcoming Detailed Proposals part of this DPD will address site allocations.

0126/01/007/Non-specific/O	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Object		The policies are mostly based on character studies of the borough and result in policies to maintain the character rather than any redevelopment. If the Council wants to see any significant change in these areas in should be mentioned in this section, as well as linking it to relevant policies which provide development. If this does not happen the section should be called "Area Character Allocations".	The council should state whether they wish to see any significant change in these areas or rename the section "Area Character Allocations".	No change	The Places of Croydon provide guidance for character management in line with National Planning Policy Framework's presumption in favour of development. Areas where growth is associated with substantial change in local character are identified in place specific policies, Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) and areas being considered for masterplans such as DM30.2, DM31, DM32.2, DM42. OAPF and potential masterplan areas have been identified as locations where substantial growth will occur. This growth will result in change to local character. In order to ensure the transformation is implemented in a cohesive way, detailed masterplanning process needs to be applied.
0126/01/011/Non-specific/C	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Comment		Referencing errors between maps in Appendix 11 and corresponding policy numbers in Section 11. Kenley and Old Coulston p150 is listed as policy DM33 but is listed as DM34 in Appendix 11. Norbury on p52 is listed as policy dm34 but listed as DM35 in Appendix 11.	Ammend referencing errors in Appendix 11 and Section 11.	Change	Policy references on maps will be corrected in the Proposed Submission version of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals, so Appendix 11 will correspond with policies in Section 11.
0115/01/018/11.001/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	11.001	11-11.7: For the area covered by ASPRA there is a lack of a school or significant medical centre. The western side of the area is being developed in a piecemeal scnario and much of the community services are provided by the church. The recreation ground has been allowed to the deteriorate with lack of investment and there is a fear that over the next 30 years the properties will be of a very low energy efficiency and so a massive redevelopment of higher density homes will be permitted.	Community facilities need to be provided and the deterioration of existing housing stock should be prevented.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through the Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in February 2014 for six weeks.
0115/01/020/11.001/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	11.001	11-11.7: The preferred approach is not sustainable because these are not natural or current administrative areas and so cannot engage with residents. They do not have clear physical or social boundaries, which impacts on a sense of belonging as residents cannot identify with such large areas. Officers will be forced to implement borough services and planning on these artificial boundaries.	Boundaries should be administrative to avoid the defintion of communities which do not exist in reality and to allow residents to identify with the areas.	No change	The Places of Croydon are not used to deliver Council services or to apply any planning policy. They are used primarily as a tool to divide the borough in a way that was intended to be more meaningful than electoral wards.

0115/01/017/11.001/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	11.001	11.2-11.7: The boundary issues between Addiscombe and Central Croydon are confused by discrepancies between maps and some sites, for example the post office sorting centre, appear to be located in two areas. The development of a 20 storey block of flats fits into central Croydon but is inappropriate for Addiscombe.	Maps should be amended to prevent discrepancies between Addiscombe and Central Croydon.	Change	As the Croydon Opportunity Area has a fixed boundary unlike the other Places all areas of overlap between Addiscombe and the Opportunity Area can and will be corrected.
0115/01/019/11.001/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	11.001	11.11.7: The policy approach is not deliverable as it is not a natural area and is an attempt to define a community that does not exist in reality. It will be an administrative functionality that contradicts ward boundaries and will disenfranchise residents.	Boundaries should be administrative to avoid the definition of communities which do not exist in reality.	No change	The Places boundaries were consulted upon previously/agreed at the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies stage.
0115/01/016/11.002/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	11.002	Paragraph 11-11.7: The areas of Croydon appear to have been selected for reasons other than planning and appears to be political rather than practical. The area of Addiscombe is too large to have any practical mechanism for public consultation afforded by the ward boundaries or Residents' Associations. The residents associations are trying to work together but are in danger of failing to reflect residents' views. Ward Councillors appear to have been excluded from meetings.	Areas of Croydon should be designated for planning and practical reasons rather than political reasons.	No change	The general concept and broad areas of the Places were originally set out and subject to public consultation as part of the preparation of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. Tweaks to boundaries are possible as part of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies but not the concept itself as the Detailed Policies legally have to be in conformity with the Strategic Policies.
0120/01/128/11.018/C	ASPRA	Comment	11.018	Section 11.18 wrongly list shops at Chepstow/Addiscombe Road. 'The non-residential character consists of "Urban Shopping Areas" (concentrated along the Lower Addiscombe Road corridor and Chepstow/Addiscombe Road); and "Industrial Estates" within the interiors of blocks, interlaced with houses.'	Section 11.18 wrongly list shops at Chepstow/Addiscombe Road.- Amend reference.	Change	'Shirely Road / Bingham Road junction' will replace the reference to Chestow/Addiscombe Road.
0101/01/018/11.101/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support	11.101	The general character of Shirley has been accurately reflected in the description contained in this paragraph		No change	
0101/01/019/11.102/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support	11.102	The general character of Shirley has been accurately reflected in the description contained in this paragraph		No change	

0101/01/020/11.102/C	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Comment	Soundness - Effective	11.102	Would like to draw attention to a specific detail of the character of the properties at Shirley Oaks which is that these properties have brown window frames	Attention should be drawn attention the brown window frames of the properties at Shirley Oaks.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. Based on this, the Croydon Local Plan cannot refer to design details such as colour of window frames. However, the local authority has an opportunity to influence colour of window frames through the planning application process.
0101/01/021/11.103/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	11.103	There is no mention of the shopping parade in Broom Road which provides local shopping and community facilities for residents of the Shrublands estate.	Some protection is necessary to ensure that these facilities are not diminished or lost	Change	There are no proposed amendments to this shopping parade and so it will continue to be protected. A Neighbourhood Centre designation is also proposed.
0105/01/052/11.103/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		11.103	Omit Paragraph 11.-03	Omit Paragraph 11.-03	No change	No justification has been provided for removal of this paragraph.
0086/01/004/Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood/C	Mr Andy Quinn	Comment		Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood	Victory Place has the potential to tie Crystal Palace district centre together but now the developer has planning permission the developer seems to have reverted back to type as he is known locally as the undeveloping developer so it doesn't look like that it is going to start anytime soon.		No change	
0086/01/001/Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood/C	Mr Andy Quinn	Comment		Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood	Is there going to be a roadshow to explain what is planned for Crystal Palace as it is not obvious to the untrained eye what is being proposed. Understood that the plan would include the location for the Enterprise Centre in Crystal Palace but it is missing from the document.		No change	In terms of local character, Crystal Palace is managed by general policies and Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Upper Norwood Triangle Conservation Area (CA), Harold Road CA and Church Street CA. Details for the proposed Enterprise Centre will be set out in the forthcoming Detailed Proposals exercise to be consulted upon later in the year.

0087/01/001/DM27 (Option 1)/O	Mr Toby Keynes	Object		DM27 (Option 1)	The detailed Places maps divide each Place into a number of segments, reflecting each segment's Predominant Character (Residential, Mixed-Use or Non-Residential). The intention, as I understand it, is that each segment's character will be better protected by being recognised within the Croydon Local Plan. That protection is lost for those parts of Riddlesdown that fall into the missing triangle and so are completely missing from the Place maps, and the whole area would be better protected for being recognised as a unified entity.	Add Riddlesdown to the Places Maps with the whole area in one Place.	Change	The boundaries of the Places are indicative and adopted as part of Croydon local Plan: Strategic Policies in 2013. The settlement of Riddlesdown was included in the description of Sanderstead.
0099/02/027/DM27 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM27 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 and the idea of separate policies to enable accurate infrastructure planning at local level.		No change	
0115/01/010/DM27 (Option 1)/S	Mr Bob Sleeman	Support		DM27 (Option 1)	Meets the strategic objectives and is deliverable as provides a snap-shot of the character of various parts of the neighbourhood.		No change	
0115/01/012/DM27 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object		DM27 (Option 1)	It is not possible to agree that the policy enables sustainable development as there is not enough detail in the maps in Appendix 9 to identify locations. The map is not fit for purpose because the colours are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network.	Map should use distinct covers and be overlaid with a road network.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 will be overlaid with street map.
0115/01/011/DM27 (Option 1)/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment		DM27 (Option 1)	Definition of sensitive areas and those where more general development could be allowed is a necessary mechanism.		No change	The comment is noted and support is welcomed.
0120/01/116/DM27 (Option 1)/S	<i>ASPRA</i>	Support		DM27 (Option 1)	Agree, the preferred policy approach is deliverable. Definition of sensitive areas and those where more general development could be allowed is a necessary, if not always popular, mechanism.	Support Policy DM27.Option 1, no change.	No change	
0120/01/114/DM27 (Option 1)/C	<i>ASPRA</i>	Comment		DM27 (Option 1)	Section 11.18 wrongly list shops at Chepstow/Addiscombe Road.	Correct Section 11.18	Change	The document will be changed to accommodate this comment: 'Chepstow/Addiscombe' will be replaced with 'Shirley Road - Bingham Junction' in paragraph 11.18.
0120/01/115/DM27 (Option 1)/S	<i>ASPRA</i>	Support		DM27 (Option 1)	Agree, the preferred policy approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. In principal this provides a snap-shot of the character of various parts of the neighbourhood.	Support Policy DM27.Option 1, no change.	No change	

0120/01/129/DM27 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM27 (Option 1)	The logic behind the choice of areas for place-specific policies is not clear to us e.g. DM29.2. It seems more important to have specific policies to protect areas that have not yet deteriorated but retain unity of architectural and functional character.	Question logic of the Place specific policies concentrating on those areas that are not consistent- should concentrate policies on the areas that have not yet deteriorated and that are consistent.	Change	The areas of consistent character are sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In case of deteriorated character, more specific guidance needs to be provided. For clarity Paragraph 11.6 will be rephrased to read: 'In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included.'
0130/01/026/DM27 (Option 1)/S	The Croydon Partnership	Support	DM27 (Option 1)	We support the Council's proposal for Option 1 and their description of the 'Croydon Opportunity Area Place' and consider it to be an important policy aspiration to enable the Council to achieve the aspirations set out in the London Plan's Strategic Policy Direction and within the Croydon OAPF.		No change	
0080/02/004/DM27 (Table 11.1)/C	Mrs Reiko Pepper	Comment	DM27 (Table 11.1)	Insertion required - 'DM32.1 Wandle Park, Waddon'. There is also wrongly coded policy starting from DM34.1 to DM42.		Change	The policy codes on drawings in Appendix 11 will be changed to address this.
0099/02/028/DM28/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified DM28	1 Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) in top 20%, 6 LSOAs in bottom 30% (1 in bottom 5%). Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.		No change	Comment noted
0103/01/017/DM28/C	Persimmon Homes	Comment	DM28	Addington is characterised by Addington Village and a mosaic of newer housing developments and green spaces. Parts of Addington are locations with very high public transport accessibility. There are opportunities within this Place to create additional places that complement and respect the historic development in the area whilst preserving and enhancing the character of the Place.	Policies should explore whether additional development could be supported.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through the Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in February 2014 for six weeks.

0103/01/014/DM28/O

Persimmon Homes

Object

DM28

DM28 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for meeting the Strategic Objectives.

No change

The place specific policies (Section 11) are designed to manage the local character. New developments should positively respond to the existing character, in line with planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included. National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies (...) should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. It also states (Paragraph 60) that 'It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness'.

Section 11 (including DM28) provides guidance for growth whilst enhancing and complementing the existing and distinctive character of the area, it also indicates areas of potential substantial character transformation with specific guidance adopted or to be developed

0103/01/015/DM28/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM28	DM28 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	No change	<p>The place specific policies (Section 11) are designed to manage the local character. New developments should positively respond to the existing character, in line with planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included. National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies (...) should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. It also states (Paragraph 60) that 'It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness'.</p> <p>Section 11 (including DM28) provides guidance for growth whilst enhancing and complementing the existing and distinctive character of the area, it also indicates areas of potential substantial character transformation with specific guidance adopted or to be developed</p>
0103/01/016/DM28/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM28	DM28 Option 1: The preferred policy approach does not enables sustainable development.	No change	<p>Policies DM28 were assessed as neutral for sustainable development. The sustainability appraisal for Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals is available online on Council Planning pages: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/localplan/clpproposals.</p>
0099/02/029/DM29.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified DM29.1	Mixed profile: 3 LSOAs in top 20%, 7 LSOAs in bottom 50%	No change	

0107/01/003/DM29.1/O	David Harmes <i>Chase Residents Association</i>	Object	DM29.1	Addiscombe District Centre - DM29.1 - A5 shops - Hot Food Takeaways - current allowed limit of 40% ! Question for Council: shop with eat in facilities (as well as take away) e.g. Fish & Chips - is this designated A3 or A5 ? Comment: If the answer to the above is A5, 40% for total A5 may be ok but if the answer is A3 (so only pure take aways are A5), 40% is much too high - limit should be more like 15-20%	Amend Policy DM29.1 so A5 shops - Hot Food Takeaways limit is 15-20% if eat in facilities are not designated as A5.	No change	Uses such as Fish and Chip shops with primarily eat in facilities as well as an ancillary take-away element are regarded as and A3. The 40% limit on A5 uses referred to should be considered alongside the limiting factor of not allowing two or more adjoining A5 units.
0107/01/001/DM29.1/O	David Harmes <i>Chase Residents Association</i>	Object	DM29.1	Addiscombe District Centre - the shops at the dar end are not included(e.g Vujon,Vets etc) why?	Addiscombe District Centre - the shops at the dar end are not included(e.g Vujon,Vets etc) why?	No change	Policy area DM29.1 refers to the area of Addiscombe District Centre, which does not include small shopping parade in the vicinity of Lower Addiscombe Road and Shirley Road junction.
0107/01/002/DM29.1/O	David Harmes <i>Chase Residents Association</i>	Object	DM29.1	Addiscombe Policy DM29 point a) Complement existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to 4 storeys and a maximum of 5 storeys around the Lower Addiscombe Road and Blackhorse Road Junction; Comment: There are no current 5 storey buildings in Addiscombe. Why should this be increased to 5 - in maintaining the character & village feel, we don't think it should - keep limit to 4	Amend Policy DM29 a)- keep height limit to 4 storeys.	No change	The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. The proposed building heights allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character.
0112/01/001/DM29.1/O	Mr Roy Colbran <i>Whitgift Estate Residents Associati</i>	Object	DM29.1	This area has suffered from mixed development and it is important to prevent further deterioration and to retain what it is good in these areas. Priority should be given to protecting those parts which have retained a unity form from being despoiled in future in the same way as the named areas in the policy.	Priority should be given to protecting the areas which have retained a unity form.	No change	Place Specific policy DM29.1 is designed to respect and enhance the existing character of Addiscombe District Centre with its unique features.
0112/01/003/DM29.1/O	Mr Roy Colbran <i>Whitgift Estate Residents Associati</i>	Object	DM29.1	The plan should include a specific reference to the Whitgift Estate which the expectation that all development will be limited to one detached house per plot to avoid subdivision and multi-occupancy. Residents of the Whitgift Estate have received proposals to sell off part of their plots to potential developers and there is a fear that houses will be replaced with a block of flats or with conversion into flats.	All development in the Whitgift Estate should be limited to one detached house per plot.	No change	The character of the Whitgift Estate is 'detached houses on relatively large plots' and it is highly consistent. Therefore it is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page
0115/01/003/DM29.1/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment	DM29.1	Anger that Charity Shops gain preferential treatment for business rates.		No change	Comment noted but not relevant to this document.

0115/01/005/DM29.1/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM29.1	Concerned that the demolition of the Black Horse Pub was allowed, with the erection of an out of character structure. Concerned whether the policy will prevent this from being repeated.	Ensure policy does not allow for further developments with out of character structures.	No change	Policy DM29.1 allows for growth whilst respecting, enhancing and complementing the existing character of the area.
0115/01/007/DM29.1/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment	DM29.1	Pedestrians would benefit from safer crossing points in Bingham Road and extra crossing points in Lower Addiscombe Road close to Baring Road and Inglis Road.	Creation of safer crossing points in Bingham Road and Lower Addiscombe Road.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new crossing facilities should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team.
0115/01/001/DM29.1/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM29.1	Suggested policy for building height and external presentation could maintain village atmosphere of central Addiscombe, but this does discourage any large outlets and therefore requires residents to travel to Purley Way.	Policy for building heights should consider large outlets	No change	Large outlets have been defined within the Croydon Local Plan as 'retail estates & business & leisure parks' (for details see Appendix 10). They are not in keeping with the predominant local character of Addiscombe District Centre. Policy DM29.1 allows for growth whilst respecting, enhancing and complementing the existing character of the area. Larger commercial units can be achieved through creative design solutions such as amalgamating shop units.
0115/01/008/DM29.1/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment	DM29.1	The mix of retail outlets has become less attractive. There is no specialist clothing shops for clothing, haberdashery, kitchen ware, furniture, antiques, artists or bookshop and some of these specialist shops do not exist in	Greater mix of retail outlets and services.	No change	The precise mix of retail units is not within the control of the Council. However, the proposed set of town centre related policies are considered to assist with greater diversity.
0115/01/002/DM29.1/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment	DM29.1	Several local traders are likely to close down. The Strategic Objectives may be met but the type of traders may no longer provide a suitable service to the local community.		No change	
0115/01/006/DM29.1/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM29.1	The lack of parking has prevented the development of any large retail outlets and is an issue for SME who rely on clients arriving by car. The tram and bus stops provide good transport links, they are not suitable for the large weekly shop or the collection of large furniture items or white goods. The delivery of stock to retail outlets also causes parking issues.	Parking issues should be addressed.	No change	These issues have recently been addressed through the major public realm improvements in Addiscombe.

0118/08/005/DM29.1/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.1	Whilst the objective of the policy and supporting text is understood and supported, the need for a flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clear and innovative and cost effective design solutions to be utilised where high design standards can still be achieved.	The need for a flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clearer.	No change	Requirement for good, innovative design is embedded in National Planning Policy Framework and the London Plan. Croydon Local Plan follows those policies in their intirety and repetitions are not required.
0118/08/006/DM29.1/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.1	DM29: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.		No change	<p>The place specific policies (Section 11) are designed to manage the local character. New developments should positively respond to the existing character, in line with planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included. National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies (...) should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. It also states (Paragraph 60) that 'It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness'.</p> <p>Section 11 (including DM29) provides guidance for growth whilst enhancing and complementing the existing and distinctive character of the area, it also indicates areas of potential substantial character transformation with specific guidance adopted or to be developed.</p>

0118/08/007/DM29.1/O <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.1	DM29: the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.		No change	Policies DM29 were assessed as positive for sustainable development. The sustainability appraisal for Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals is available online on Council Planning pages: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/localplan/clpproposals .
0118/08/001/DM29.1/O <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.1	The policy seeks to limit storey height to a maximum of 5 storeys. Flexibility to accommodate 6 or more storeys where relevant and sustainable, particularly where this might aid viability and the delivery of other key policy objectives, including affordable housing delivery.	Amend policy to allow for flexibility to accommodate 6 or more storeys where relevant and sustainable.	No change	The proposed building heights allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character. Areas where new development can be significantly taller or larger than the predominant scale and massing of buildings has been described in policy DM15. These include locations identified in Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework and Masterplans.
0118/08/003/DM29.1/O <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.1	Very specific design features should not be encompassed within Policy.	Amend policy to remove very specific design features.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies (...) should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'.
0120/01/100/DM29.1/O <i>ASPRA</i>	Object	DM29.1	DM29.1 b Agree strongly that ground floor frontages should remain active and un-obscured. Additionally, however, while the rhythm of the separate individual buildings is attractive and beneficial, it should not preclude separate ground floor units from being joined where this may make a business more viable or where an already successful business may hope to expand. Some of the smaller business units may be too small to practically allow even a small business to successfully operate, with the result that the unit may remain empty, indefinitely, and thereby breaking the rhythm. The safe-guard in retaining the rhythm would be maintained by further guidelines being established in relation to the joining of separate units sympathetically.	Consider revising Policy DM29.1b to allow more flexibility for use.	No change	The policy does not preclude the combining of smaller units into larger units (which on its own does not require planning permission). Rhythm, size and continuity can still be maintained as the only thing that would be precluded is the replacement of two or more shopfronts with a single glass frontage with no divides. The original shopfronts do not need to be retained.

0120/01/102/DM29.1/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.1	There appear to be several traders who are likely to close down, so there is a risk that Strategic Objectives are met but the type of traders no longer provides a suitable service to the local community.	Consider the risk in the Policy DM29 that the type of traders locating to Addiscombe no longer provides a suitable service to the local community.	No change	The wording of the policy 29.1 remains in line with paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The intention is to guide the design and appearance not to restrict uses of particular premises.
0120/01/107/DM29.1/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.1	No, the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development. The major problem that has precluded development of any large retail outlets is the lack of parking space. This also mitigates against any SME who relies on clients arriving by car. While Addiscombe Tram stop and bus stops provide good transport links, they are not really suitable for the large weekly shop, or collection of larger items of furniture or white goods. Delivery of stock to retail outlets often causes parking issues e.g. double parking or parking on zig-zag lines.	Policy DM29 needs to consider parking issues of Addiscombe.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Suggestions for location of new parking facilities should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team.
0120/01/105/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	The local traders association has folded so there is minimal coordinated representation to the council.	Comment-No change proposed.	No change	
0120/01/104/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	In Addiscombe, there is anger that Charity Shops gain preferential treatment for business rates.	Comment-No change proposed.	No change	Comment noted.
0120/01/101/DM29.1/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.1	Agree-think that the preferred policy approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The suggested policy for building height and external presentation could maintain the village atmosphere of central Addiscombe. However this does also discourage any large outlets and therefore requires residents to travel (often by car) to Purley Way etc.	Support Policy DM29.1 but consider how to enable flexibility to avoid discouraging larger outlets from locating in Addiscombe.	No change	Large outlets have been defined within the Croydon Local Plan as 'retail estates & business & leisure parks' (for details see Appendix 10). They are not in keeping with the predominant local character of Addiscombe District Centre. Policy DM29.1 allows for growth whilst respecting, enhancing and complementing the existing character of the area. Larger commercial units can be achieved through creative design solutions such as amalgamating shop units.
0120/01/099/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	DM29.1 a "Blackhorse Road" is referred to in the document but I presume this to mean Blackhorse Lane.	Coorrect reference to Blackhorse Lane in DM29.1 a	Change	All references to Blackhorse Road in Addiscombe related section of the document will be amended to Blackhorse Lane.

0120/01/109/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	The mix of retail outlets has become less attractive, although the multiple Charity shops provide a wide selection of second hand goods. There is no specialist clothing shop for ladies, children's or gents, no haberdashery, no kitchen ware, no furniture, no antiques no artists or bookshop. Some of these specialist shops do not exist in central Croydon either.	Comment on Addiscombe mix of shops. No change proposed.	No change	
0120/01/038/DM29.1/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.1	If the answer is yes to A5 designation for shop with eat in facilities (as well as take away) e.g. E.g. Fish and Chips- 40% for total A5 may be ok, but if the answer is A3 (so only pure takeaways are A5) 40% is much to high- limit should be more like 15-20%	Clarify if shop with eat in facilities (as well as take away) e.g. E.g. Fish and Chips- is designated A3 or A5? If answer is A3 adjust percentage allowed..	No change	Uses such as Fish and Chip shops with primarily eat in facilities as well as an ancillary take-away element are regarded as and A3. The 40% limit on A5 uses referred to should be considered alongside the limiting factor of not allowing two or more adjoining A5 units.
0120/01/037/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	A5 shops- Hot food takeaways- current allowed limit of 40%! Question for Council: shop with eat in facilities (as well as take away) e.g. E.g. Fish and Chips- is this designated A3 or A5?	Clarify if shop with eat in facilities (as well as take away) e.g. E.g. Fish and Chips- is designated A3 or A5?	No change	
0120/01/035/DM29.1/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.1	Addiscombe District Centre- DM29.1 - the shops at the far(Eastern) end of Addiscombe are not included (e.g. Vujon, Vets ETC)- Why? They are close to the shops and library in Shirley Road, as well as to Ashburton Park, Teso Express.	Change required to District Centre boundary.	No change	The character of this section of Lower Addiscombe Road is highly consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7).
0120/01/036/DM29.1/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.1	Addiscombe Policy DM29 a)- Ther are no current 5 storey buildings in Addiscombe- why should this be increased to 5- in maintaining the character & village feel, we don't think it should- keep limit to 4 storeys.	Amend Policy 29 a) limit to 4 storeys from 5.	No change	A positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. The proposed building heights allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character.
0120/01/108/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	Access by foot from the south would benefit from safer crossing points in Bingham Road and in extra crossing points in Lower Addiscombe Road close to Baring Road and Inglis Road.	Policy DM to consider provision of new crossing points in Addiscombe.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugestions for location of new crossing facilities should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team.
0120/01/103/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	In Addiscombe, the lack of a Traders' Association is evidence that conditions are below optimum.	Comment-No change proposed.	No change	

0120/01/106/DM29.1/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM29.1	Yes, the policy approach is deliverable. The concern remains that the planning system allowed the demolition of the Black Horse Pub and the erection of an out of character structure. Will these words actually stop a repeat?	Test the policy to check if it will stop demolition of a building like the Blackhorse Pub.	No change	The new development should positively respond to the existing character, as per general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9 and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). Place specific policies allow for growth whilst respecting, enhancing and complementing the existing character of the area.
0122/02/010/DM29.1/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	DM29.1	Would like places for flowers at the junction of Lower Addiscombe Road and Blackhorse Road and flowers or baskets along Lower Addiscombe Road shopping area.	Flowers and hanging baskets to be provided at the junction of Lower Addiscombe Road, Blackhorse Road and Lower Addiscombe Road.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for street scene improvements should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team.
0122/02/011/DM29.1/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	DM29.1	Zebra or pedestrian crossing near St Mildred's Church on Bingham Road which is dangerous and difficult to cross.	Provision of zebra and pedestrian crossing near St Mildred's Church on Bingham Road.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new crossing facilities should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team.
0129/01/019/DM29.1/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM29.1	The policy approach meets narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable. The impact on existing residents is not considered by this policy or by DM32. The policy does not consider the western part of Addiscombe, which is the area which will be most affect by the East Croydon masterplan and DM32.	Policy should consider the western part of Addiscombe.	No change	The western part of Addiscombe ward lies within Croydon Opportunity Area, therefore its developments in this location are managed by Opportunity Area Planning Framework, DM32, and general design and character policies (Section 6). Boundaries of Croydon Opportunity Area were established in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012.
0129/01/015/DM29.1/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM29.1	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. The impact on existing residents is not considered by this policy or by DM32. The policy does not consider the western part of Addiscombe, which is the area which will be most affect by the East Croydon masterplan and DM32.	Policy should consider the western part of Addiscombe.	No change	The western part of Addiscombe ward lies within Croydon Opportunity Area, therefore its developments in this location are managed by Opportunity Area Planning Framework, DM32, and general design and character policies (Section 6). Boundaries of Croydon Opportunity Area were established in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012. Policy 29.1 refers solely to the area indicated on the map in Appendix 11, page 314.

0129/01/017/DM29.1/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM29.1	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. The impact on existing residents is not considered by this policy or by DM32. The policy does not consider the western part of Addiscombe, which is the area which will be most affect by the East Croydon masterplan and DM32.	Policy should consider the western part of Addiscombe.	No change	The western part of Addiscombe ward lies within Croydon Opportunity Area, therefore its developments in this location are managed by Opportunity Area Planning Framework, DM32, and general design and character policies (Section 6). Boundaries of Croydon Opportunity Area were established in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012.
0099/02/030/DM29.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM29.2	Mixed profile: 3 LSOAs in top 20%, 7 LSOAs in bottom 50%		No change	
0107/01/010/DM29.2/C	David Harmes Chase Residents Association	Comment		DM29.2	7. Area DM29.2 d) Enhance existing and provide new direct public walking and cycling routes to Addiscombe Railway Park; Question for Council: how ? (more detail please) Are there plans for the Council to take ownership of the entrance alleyway to the Park from the East India Estate (Council does not currently own this and it is used as (one of) the excuses as to why security to prevent travellers gaining access can't be improved.	Explanation required regarding how DM29.2 d will be delivered and if there are any plans to take ownership of the entrance alleyway to Addiscombe Railway Park from the East India Estate.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Policy DM29.2 d facilitates delivery of public realm network through planning application process for future development proposals.
0107/01/005/DM29.2/O	David Harmes Chase Residents Association	Object		DM29.2	Question for Council: the area of shops in and around Cherry Orchard (including those on Lower Addiscombe Road) e.g. Between DM29.2 & DM32.1 - no plans/policies for this - why not ? Comment: this is the gateway between the Town Centre & Addiscombe - it needs to be improved but in a managed way so should be a designated area.	Clarification required on why no plans or policies for the area of shops in and around Cherry Orchard (including those on Lower Addiscombe Road) e.g. Between DM29.2 & DM32.1	No change	The character of the area of shops in and around Cherry Orchard (including those on Lower Addiscombe Road) e.g. Between DM29.2 & DM32.1 is highly consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7).
0107/01/004/DM29.2/O	David Harmes Chase Residents Association	Object		DM29.2	Area of DM29.2 Question for Council: to the west, why does this stop between 2 residential buildings ?	Clarify and provide reasons why area of DM29.2 boundary stops between 2 residential buildings	No change	The area being subject of Policy 29.2 is an area where local character is highly inconsistent and under the development pressure. 86-88 Lower Addiscombe Road was not included in this policy area because it is Locally Listed and development of these buildings would be guided by heritage policies.

0112/01/002/DM29.2/O	Mr Roy Colbran <i>Whitgift Estate Residents Associati</i>	Object	DM29.2	This area has suffered from mixed development and it is important to prevent further deterioration and to retain what it is good in these areas. Priority should be given to protecting those parts which have retained a unity form from being despoiled in future in the same way as the named areas in the policy.	Priority should be given to protecting the areas which have retained a unity form.	No change	The policy DM29.2 was designed to manage further character transformations in order to establish high quality urban environment. It provides guidance for any future development in the area.
0118/08/002/DM29.2/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.2	The policy seeks to limit storey height to a maximum of 5 storeys. Flexibility to accommodate 6 or more storeys where relevant and suitable, particularly where this might aid viability and the delivery of other key policy objectives, including affordable housing delivery.	Amend policy to allow for flexibility to accommodate 6 or more storeys where relevant and sustainable.	No change	The proposed building heights allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character. Areas where new development can be significantly taller or larger than the predominant scale and massing of buildings has been identified in policy DM15. These include areas identified in Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework and Masterplans.
0118/08/004/DM29.2/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM29.2	It is not considered necessary to specify material. To express preference may be acceptable but should not be determined prior to site-specific considerations being assessed.	Amend policy to remove specific materials.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies (...) should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. It also states (Paragraph 60) that 'It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.'. Materials are an important feature which positively contribute to the local character and distinctiveness of DM29.1 area.
0120/01/039/DM29.2/O	<i>ASPRA</i>	Object	DM29.2	Area to the west why does this stop between 2 residential buildings?	Boundary change to area DM29.2	No change	The area being subject of Policy 29.2 is an area where local character is highly inconsistent and under the development pressure. 86-88 Lower Addiscombe Road was not included in this policy area because it is Locally Listed and development of these buildings would be guided by heritage policies.

0120/01/041/DM29.2/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.2	The areas of shops in and around Cherry Orchard (including those on Lower Addiscombe Road) e.g. between DM29.2 & DM32.1-there are no plans/policies for this- why not?	Provide plans/policies for the areas of shops in and around Cherry Orchard (including those on Lower Addiscombe Road) e.g. between DM29.2 & DM32.1	No change	The character of this area is consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7).
0120/01/042/DM29.2/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.2	Comment: This is the gateway between the Town Centre & Addiscombe -it needs to be improved but in a managed way so should be a designated area.	DM29.2 Designate the area between the Town Centre & Addiscombe- between area DM29.2 and DM32.1	No change	The character of the area between the Town Centre & Addiscombe is fairly consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7).
0120/01/043/DM29.2/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.2	The proposed plans fail to take opportunity for supporting and improving the shopping parade of Lower Addiscombe Road & Cherry Orchard Road. (i.e. in between DM32.1 & DM29.2, West of the Leslie Arms roundabout	Ensure the proposed plans take opportunity for supporting and improving the shopping parade of Lower Addiscombe Road & Cherry Orchard Road. (i.e. in between DM32.1 & DM29.2, West of the Leslie Arms roundabout	No change	The character of the shopping parade of Lower Addiscombe Road & Cherry Orchard Road is consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7).
0120/01/044/DM29.2/O	ASPRA	Object	DM29.2	Their comment in the minutes that this parade hasn't been identified for change in the plan because "it has been assessed and still provides a shopping parade function so no changes are sought' however what is needed is to recognise that this area could benefit from improvement to parking and traffic management to improve access and use of the shops & possibly attract more shops and businesses to this area serving relatively cheap rents.	Need place specific policy/plans for this area to recognise that this area could benefit from improvement to parking and traffic management to improve access and use of the shops & possibly attract more shops and businesses to this area serving relatively cheap rents.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new parking and traffic management facilities should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.
0129/01/020/DM29.2/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object	DM29.2	The policy approach meets narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable. The impact on existing residents is not considered by this policy or by DM32. The policy does not consider the western part of Addiscombe, which is the area which will be most affect by the East Croydon masterplan and DM32.	Policy should consider the western part of Addiscombe.	No change	The western part of Addiscombe ward lies within Croydon Opportunity Area, therefore its developments in this location are managed by Opportunity Area Planning Framework, DM32, and general design and character policies (Section 6). Boundaries of Croydon Opportunity Area were established in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012.

0129/01/018/DM29.2/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object	DM29.2	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. The impact on existing residents is not considered by this policy or by DM32. The policy does not consider the western part of Addiscombe, which is the area which will be most affect by the East Croydon masterplan and DM32.	Policy should consider the western part of Addiscombe.	No change	The western part of Addiscombe ward lies within Croydon Opportunity Area, therefore its developments in this location are managed by Opportunity Area Planning Framework, DM32, and general design and character policies (Section 6). Boundaries of Croydon Opportunity Area were established in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012.
0129/01/016/DM29.2/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object	DM29.2	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. The impact on existing residents is not considered by this policy or by DM32. The policy does not consider the western part of Addiscombe, which is the area which will be most affect by the East Croydon masterplan and DM32.	Policy should consider the western part of Addiscombe.	No change	The western part of Addiscombe ward lies within Croydon Opportunity Area, therefore its developments in this location are managed by Opportunity Area Planning Framework, DM32, and general design and character policies (Section 6). Boundaries of Croydon Opportunity Area were established in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, adopted in 2012.
0093/01/008/DM30.1/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment	DM30.1	It is noted that a masterplan is proposed for Valley Park. The Council are requested to work with TfL in the preparation of these masterplans to ensure any proposals are in accordance with the outcomes of this study.		No change	The Council will continue to engage with Transport for London when developing masterplans in the London Borough of Croydon.
0093/01/020/DM30.1/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment	DM30.1	Would welcome the opportunity to work with the council from an early stage on any masterplan for the Valley Park area. Discussions have taken place in the past with regard to potential changes to access into and out of the retail park and it is understood that ths remains an aspiration of the landowner. Any such changes are likely to have an impact of traffic on the A23 and this will need to be understood.		No change	The Council will continue to engage with Transport for London when developing masterplans in the London Borough of Croydon.
0099/02/031/DM30.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified DM30.1	Broad Green: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50% (one in bottom 5%). Selhurst: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.		No change	Comment noted.

0099/02/032/DM30.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM30.2	Broad Green: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50% (one in bottom 5%). Selhurst: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.	
0126/01/004/DM30.2/C	Claire O'Donovan <i>Merton Council</i>	Comment		DM30.2	Unclear what evidence is used to justify the re-designation of this designated out-of-centre Retail Park to be designated as local centre. No clear proposals as to what the Council intends to happen in this location, for example does the council intend for more retail services and facilities to be developed in this location which consequently may result in this area growing to District/Major town centre status. Concerned over the cumulative impact on the vitality and viability of Merton's designated town centres, particularly combined with redevelopment of the Whitgift Centre and the findings of the GLA's experian consumer expenditure and comparison goods floorspace need in London.	Provide details on the evidence used to justify the new designation and what the council intends to happen at the Retail Park.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. They are not designations. The area of Valley Park has been identified in Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (adopted in 2012) as a potential local centre. To manage such substantial character transformation, the masterplan is being considered.
0099/02/033/DM30.3/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM30.3	Broad Green: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50% (one in bottom 5%). Selhurst: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.	
0099/02/034/DM30.4/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM30.4	Broad Green: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50% (one in bottom 5%). Selhurst: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.	
0099/02/035/DM30.5/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM30.5	Broad Green: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50% (one in bottom 5%). Selhurst: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.	

0099/02/036/DM31/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM31	Coulsdon East: 6 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 in bottom 50%. Coulsdon West: 7 LSOAs in top 80%, 2 in bottom 50%.		No change	
0198/01/002/DM31/C	Graham Lomas	Comment		DM31	The press issue relating to the Coulsdon Masterplan states that the Council will rely on the Local Plan but this policy says that the Local Plan should follow the Coulsdon Masterplan. Puzzled as to what document on which proposals for planning in Coulsdon are justified/validated.		Change	The Coulsdon Masterplan was withdrawn by the Council after the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) consultation was endorsed by the Council's Cabinet and after it had been sent to the printers. Policy DM31 will need to be revised to reflect the fact that the Coulsdon Masterplan no longer exists.
0003/05/017/DM32.1/S	Mr David Hammond Natural England	Support		DM32.1	Policy is welcomed.	Can be linked to other policies, for example DM22, to further strengthen document.	Welcome support	DM22 is an overarching policy, therefore it applies to every Place in Croydon.
0051/02/002/DM32.1/O	Edward Moody Minerva	Object	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM32.1	While the Policy is in accord with the OAPF there is a need for a comprehensive masterplan led approach and how this is reflected needs further consideration in the light of proposals that are emerging for the New Town and Retail Core on which we would seek to comment at the appropriate times proposals and policies evolve.		No change	Noted. Information for planning applications in the area and opportunities to comment on them can be done via Croydon Council's planning pages on the following link: http://publicaccess.croydon.gov.uk/online-applications/ .
0099/02/037/DM32.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM32.1	7,300 new homes will require capacity for c. nine new whole time equivalent GPs plus additional community services. New housing represents 100% increase in local population.		No change	Comment noted.
0120/01/001/DM32.1/O	ASPRA	Object		DM32.1	The council assures that overlapping boundaries between the 16 'Places of Croydon' (PoC) will respect residents' perspectives in both areas. Even if the Council say that the town centre 'Croydon opportunity area' PoC is the correct place to address concerns with area DM32.1, the council do not appear to be working in spirit of this concept when it comes to the overlapping boundary between our & the town centre PoCs. This means that neither PoC considers DM32.1's impact upon existing residents, such as those living in terraced housing in and around the area- but the town Centre PoC does consider those types of residents who live in and around London Rd.	Consider reviewing boundaries of Places of Croydon.	Change	As the Croydon Opportunity Area has a fixed boundary unlike the other Places all areas of overlap between Addiscombe and the Opportunity Area can and will be removed.

0129/01/025/DM32.1/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.1	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.
0129/01/021/DM32.1/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.1	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	
0129/01/029/DM32.1/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.1	Policy approach meets narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable.	Policy should enable sustainable development.	No change	The sustainability appraisal for Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals have been carried out and is available online on Council Planning pages: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/localplan/clpproposals . Policies DM32 are neutral for sustainable development.
0130/01/027/DM32.1/O	The Croydon Partnership	Object		DM32.1	We also support the principles of draft Policy DM32, however ask should the Council seek to adopt Policy DM32 it include two specific points of clarification. First, Draft Policy DM32.1 states that a masterplan will be created for Old Town. Old Town, as a geographical area, is covered by the existing Croydon OAPF and, as such, Policy DM32.1 should make it clear that, when published, the Old Town Masterplan will be consistent with and complementary to the OAPF.	Policy DM32.1 should make it clear that, when published, the Old Town Masterplan will be consistent with and complementary to the OAPF.	No change	DM32.1 will be rephrased to read: To enable development opportunities; including public realm improvements, to be undertaken in a cohesive and coordinated manner a Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework complemented by masterplans for Fair Field, Mid Croydon, West Croydon, East Croydon and Old Town have been adopted.
0130/01/028/DM32.1/O	The Croydon Partnership	Object		DM32.1	Draft Policy DM32.3 sets design controls for 'the London Road area'. If adopted, the Council should confirm that the 'London Road area' does not form part of the Retail Core as defined in the Croydon OAPF.	Clarification required in Policy DM32.3,- the Council should confirm that the 'London Road area' does not form part of the Retail Core as defined in the Croydon OAPF.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character, they are not designations.
0099/02/038/DM32.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM32.2	7,300 new homes will require capacity for c. nine new whole time equivalent GPs plus additional community services. New housing represents 100% increase in local population.		No change	Comment noted.

0129/01/030/DM32.2/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.2	Policy approach meets narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable.	Policy should enable sustainable development.	No change	Policies DM32 were assessed as neutral for sustainable development. The sustainability appraisal for Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals is available online on Council Planning pages: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/localplan/clpproposals .
0129/01/026/DM32.2/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.2	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.
0129/01/022/DM32.2/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.2	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.
0099/02/039/DM32.3/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM32.3	7,300 new homes will require capacity for c. nine new whole time equivalent GPs plus additional community services. New housing represents 100% increase in local population.		No change	Comment noted.
0129/01/031/DM32.3/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.3	Policy approach meets narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable.	Policy should enable sustainable development.	No change	Policies DM32 were assessed as neutral for sustainable development. The sustainability appraisal for Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals is available online on Council Planning pages: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/localplan/clpproposals .
0129/01/027/DM32.3/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.3	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.

0129/01/023/DM32.3/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.3	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.
0099/02/040/DM32.4/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM32.4	7,300 new homes will require capacity for c. nine new whole time equivalent GPs plus additional community services. New housing represents 100% increase in local population.		No change	Comment noted.
0129/01/032/DM32.4/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.4	Policy approach meets narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable.	Policy should enable sustainable development.	No change	
0129/01/028/DM32.4/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.4	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.
0129/01/024/DM32.4/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM32.4	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. Concerns over where S106 money goes and whether it improves facilities for existing residents. There should be funds in mind of improving and mitigating new development impact upon existing residents.	S106 money should be used to mitigate the impact of new development upon existing residents.	No change	Any S106 agreement attached to a planning application normally requires the money is spent within the locality of the development.
0080/02/002/DM33/C	Mrs Reiko Pepper	Comment		DM33	Kenley Station building should be added to the Local List.	Add Kenley Station to the Local List	No change	Kenley Station House (the original 1856 building) on Hayes Lane is Grade II listed. The recommendation to include the main Kenley Station building has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance.
0099/02/041/DM33/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM33	Kenley: 6 LSOAs in top 20%, 3 in bottom 50%.		No change	
0099/02/042/DM34.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM34.1	3 LSOAs in top 20%, 6 LSOAs in bottom 50%.		No change	
0099/02/043/DM34.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM34.2	3 LSOAs in top 20%, 6 LSOAs in bottom 50%.		No change	

0094/01/003/DM35.1/O	Mr Ken Whittick	Object		DM35.1	<p>The Places of Croydon: Purley. Policy DM35.1, page 153. In the Planning Inspectors report on Croydon's core strategy, paragraph 65, he said</p> <p>'The question was raised as to whether it should include specific references to facilities such as Purley Pool. While the Council agreed at the Hearings that Purley Pool should be retained either on its existing site or a nearby site, the Plan is a strategic document and is not the place to deal with individual sites. These will be dealt with through the emerging Croydon Local Plan :Detailed Policies and Proposals.'</p> <p>We believe that the existing community facility of a gym and swimming pool on its existing site, or one close by, should remain available to the people of the borough and should be protected by including it in Policy DM35.1 This aspiration has been supported by all the councillors of Purley and Kenley and by the leaders of the main parties. Amend policy DM35.1 to include this aspiration.</p>	Amend policy DM35.1 to include this aspiration of a gym and swimming pool on its existing site, or one close by,	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.
0094/01/004/DM35.1/S	Mr Ken Whittick	Support		DM35.1	<p>Policy DM35.1c-We have already identified many ways in which frontages in the High Street and Whytecliffe Road South could be improved and have supported these ideas in the past with photographs. We endorse this policy.</p>		No change	
0099/02/044/DM35.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM35.1	<p>5 LSOAs in top 20%, 4 LSOAs in bottom 50%</p>		No change	
0106/01/002/DM35.1/O	Mr Jeff Cunliffe	Object		DM35.1	<p>It is imperative that this policy to retain Purley pool, or relocate on a site nearby is included in the Croydon Plan section 11.</p>	<p>Policy to retain Purley pool, or relocate on a site nearby is included in the Croydon Plan section 11.</p>	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through the Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in February 2014 for six weeks.

0106/01/003/DM35.1/O	Mr Jeff Cunliffe	Object	DM35.1	Am a regular user of the swimming facilities in Purley and consider the leisure centre as key to the town's success. I am aware that the policy of retaining it at its present site or one nearby has the support not only of the councillors of Purley and Kenley but also of the leaders of all main parties. It is imperative that this policy is included in the Croydon Plan section 11. Furthermore policy DM35.1 should be deleted	Policy DM35.1 should be deleted.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014. The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. Policy DM35.1 allow for growth whilst respecting, enhance and complement existing character of Purley Town Centre.
0121/01/027/DM35.1/S	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Support	DM35.1	Agree with preferred option.		No change	
0143/01/002/DM35.1/O	Alison Trundell	Object	DM35.1	The leisure centre is important to the town as a whole and understand that the policy of retaining it at its present site or one nearby has the support not only of the councillors of Purley and Kenley but also of the leaders of all main parties. I think it is imperative that this policy should be included in the Croydon Plan section 11 and that policy DM35.1 should be deleted.	Add policy for retention of Purley pool in Purley at its present site or nearby in Section 11 and delete policy DM35.1	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.
0178/01/002/DM35.1/O	Mr Ray Morriss	Object	DM35.1	Purley has an excellent leisure centre, including a much-used swimming pool and gym, which it is important to keep for both the benefit of it's residents health and fitness, and the well being of Purley itself. There are many ways in which Purley could be improved, and a start has already been made with the renovation of the local hospital, and there are plans in hand to improve the Baptist Church. Keeping or indeed improving the leisure centre would therefore prove plans to make Purley a vibrant area are serious. As I understand it, the centres retention has the backing of local concillors as well as all main political parties. It should therefore be included in CLP section 1.1m and policy DM35.1 deleted.	Purley leisure centre's retention should therefore be included in CLP section 1.1m and policy DM35.1 deleted.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.

0180/01/002/DM35.1/O	Anne Gasnola	Object	DM35.1	CLP section 11 and policy DM35 should be deleted.	CLP section 11 and policy DM35 should be deleted.	No change	<p>The place specific policies (Section 11) are designed to manage the local character. New developments should positively respond to the existing character, in line with planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). In specific areas where it is unclear which predominant character should be referenced, additional place specific development management policies have been included. National Planning Policy Framework clearly states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies (...) should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. It also states (Paragraph 60) that 'It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness'.</p> <p>Section 11 (including DM35) provides guidance for growth whilst enhancing and complementing the existing and distinctive character of the area, it also indicates areas of potential substantial character transformation with specific guidance adopted or to be developed.</p>
0181/01/002/DM35.1/O	Susan Arrol	Object	DM35.1	<p>This facility ,we feel, must remain at its present or nearby site as it is part of the health and life blood of the town centre.</p> <p>This policy consideration should be included in the Croydon Plan Section 11 and the policy DM35 1 should be deleted.</p>	Add to the Local Plan consideration of retention of Purley leisure centre and pool in Section 11 and delete DM35.1	No change	<p>The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.</p> <p>The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. Policy DM35.1 allow for growth whilst respecting, enhance and complement existing character of Purley Town Centre.</p>

0183/01/002/DM35.1/O	Peta Barber	Object		DM35.1	<p>The leisure centre is a most important part of the town and to keep it on its present site or one closeby has the support not only of the councillors of Purley and Kenley but also of the leaders of all the main parties.</p> <p>This vision should be included in the CLP section 11 and policy DM35.1 should be deleted</p>	<p>This vision should be included in the CLP section 11 and policy DM35.1 should be deleted</p>	No change	<p>The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.</p> <p>The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. Policy DM35.1 allow for growth whilst respecting, enhance and complement existing character of Purley Town Centre.</p>
0191/01/002/DM35.1/O	Frances Wood	Object		DM35.1	<p>I ask that Croydon keep this pool and it should be included in the Croydon Plan under section 11. Policy DM35.1, however is undoing a great deal for everyone and will leave another generation having less of a life in a bid to make a few people richer and happier for themselves in their life. Think about the rest of the human race to come who will have little due to self-centred view of small minded individuals who only promote planning ideas to promote themselves.</p>	Amend/delete policy DM35.1	No change	<p>The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses were provided through Call for Sites' procedure which was re-launched in 2014.</p> <p>The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. Policy DM35.1 allow for growth whilst respecting, enhance and complement existing character of Purley Town Centre.</p>
0099/02/045/DM35.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM35.2	5 LSOAs in top 20%, 4 LSOAs in bottom 50%		No change	
0099/02/046/DM35.3/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM35.3	5 LSOAs in top 20%, 4 LSOAs in bottom 50%		No change	
0099/02/047/DM36.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM36.1	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 1 LSOA in bottom 50%		No change	
0099/02/048/DM36.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM36.2	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 1 LSOA in bottom 50%		No change	
0119/01/006/DM36.2/S	<i>Tandridge District Council</i>	Support		DM36.2	The preferred option- Option1 FOR Hamsey Green Local Centre- Policy DM36.2 is supported.		No change	Welcome support.
0099/02/049/DM37.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM37.1	8 LSOAs in top 20%		No change	

0099/02/050/DM37.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM37.2	8 LSOAs in top 20%		No change	
0099/02/051/DM38.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM38.1	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	
0101/01/022/DM38.1/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM38.1	The preferred option is the most appropriate and deliverable policy for the Shirley Local Centre, allowing sustainable development whilst protecting and enhancing its character		No change	
0105/01/051/DM38.1/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM38.1	Amend Policy DM38.1c) as follows:- c) change building heights from 4 storeys to 3 storeys and add words Local Centre- as follows- `Complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 3 storeys; within local Centre;	Amend Policy DM38.1c) as follows:- c) change building heights from 4 storeys to 3 storeys and add words Local Centre- as follows- `Complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 3 storeys; within local Centre;	No change	All points in the Policy 38.1 refer to Shirley Local Centre. This is also reflectd on the map on page 323.

0105/01/050/11.101/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	11.101	Amend paragraph 11.101. to add 2 new paragraphs between 11.101 and 11.102 as follows:- Areas such as Monks Orchard retain a specific character which is derived by a combining the mixture of bungalows, chalet bungalows, detached, semidetached and terraces set in narrow tree lined roads. This combination creates an open varied and interesting skyline and roofscape. □ The character of areas such as Monks Orchard is further enhanced by the variety of size of house and garden plots which maintains the open characteristic of this area which is a dominant feature which play a vital role in creating Monks Orchard	Amend paragraph 11.101. to add 2 new paragraphs between 11.101 and 11.102 as follows:- Areas such as Monks Orchard retain a specific character which is derived by a combining the mixture of bungalows, chalet bungalows, detached, semidetached and terraces set in narrow tree lined roads. This combination creates an open varied and interesting skyline and roofscape. □ The character of areas such as Monks Orchard is further enhanced by the variety of size of house and garden plots which maintains the open characteristic of this area which is a dominant feature which play a vital role in creating Monks Orchard sense of place.	Change	The predominant residential character types in Shirley are "Planned Estates of Semi-Detached Houses" with garages and "Compact Houses on Relatively Small Plots". These types include buildings such as bungalows, chalet bungalows, detached, semidetached and terraces. Residential character is defined not only by the buildings but also the land around it including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page 255. Changes to the text of the document are as follows: - Replace paragraph 11.101 with the following text: Shirley is predominantly a suburban residential settlement surrounded by natural areas of Green Belt. This place is defined by the tree lined streets, the regular rhythm of well-spaced buildings with well-kept landscaped areas to the front, that allow oblique long range views beyond the rear gardens. - Replace paragraph 11.102 with the following text: Shirley's residential character predominantly consists of "Planned Estates of Semi-Detached Houses" with garages and "Mixed Type Flats and Compact Houses" set in large green spaces. This combination creates an open varied and interesting skyline and roofscape. The southern part is dominated by "Scattered Houses on Large Plots" surrounded by expansive areas of greenery, including
0099/02/052/DM38.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified DM38.2	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	
0101/01/024/DM38.2/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support	DM38.2	The preferred option is the most appropriate and deliverable policy for the Shirley Local Centre, allowing sustainable development sympathetic to the character of Shirley		Welcome support	

0099/02/053/DM38.3/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM38.3	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	
0101/01/025/DM38.3/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM38.3	The preferred option is the most appropriate and deliverable policy for the Shirley Local Centre, allowing sustainable development whilst protecting and enhancing its character		No change	The comment is noted and support is welcomed.
0099/02/054/DM38.4/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM38.4	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	
0101/01/026/DM38.4/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM38.4	At present the building behind the Shirley Road Shopping Parade is a single, detached house. Therefore, it is inappropriate to allow proposals of up to 4 storeys directly behind this parade.	Consider changes to the text of the policy to reduce the maximum height for the development of proposals directly behind the Shirley Road Shopping Parade.	No change	Since consultation in 2013, the Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted which incorporate a significant increase in housing target from 1330 to 1435. Furthermore the London Plan is clear that this target should be considered as minimum. The partial review of Croydon Local Plan (CLP 1.1) set the strategy to accommodate growth within urban area. Detailed Planning Policies need to respond to these changes. The area meets criteria for DM31.4 designation of focussed intensification.
0105/01/053/DM38.4/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM38.4	No change to policy DM38.2 and DM38.3, but modify DM38.4 a) to omit ` 3 storeys along Shirley Road, and 2 storeys up to a maximum of 4 storeys directly behind the parade` with revised wording as follows- a) Complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 3 storeys directly behind the parade;	Ammend DM38.4 a) to omit ` 3 storeys along Shirley Road, and 2 storeys up to a maximum of 4 storeys directly behind the parade` with revised wording as follows- a) Complement the existing predominant building heights of 2 storeys up to a maximum of 3 storeys directly behind the parade	No change	The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. The proposed building heights allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character.
0099/02/055/DM39.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM39.1	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	
0099/02/056/DM39.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM39.2	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	
0099/02/057/DM39.3/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM39.3	7 LSOAs in top 20%, 2 LSOAs in bottom 20%		No change	

0102/01/007/DM39.3/O	Joint LPA Receivers	Object	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM39.3	This policy is unduly prescriptive and is not supported by the evidence. Neither does it accord with para 59 of the NPPF. Also note DM.39 is incorrectly labelled as DM40.3 on page 324.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. Policy DM39.3 clearly refers to developments scale and landscape, therefore it is in line with national policies. Change of label on page 324 from DM.40.1 to DM.39.1, DM 40.2 to DM.39.2 and DM40.3 to DM39.3
0099/02/058/DM40.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM40.1	South Norwood: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Woodside: 1 LSOA in top 20%, 9 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.
0099/02/059/DM40.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM40.2	South Norwood: 10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Woodside: 1 LSOA in top 20%, 9 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.
0099/02/060/DM41.1/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM41.1	10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.
0099/02/061/DM41.2/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM41.2	10 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.	No change	Comment noted.

0093/01/009/DM42/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment		DM42	It is noted that a masterplan is proposed for Waddon. The Council are requested to work with TfL in the preparation of these masterplans to ensure any proposals are in accordance with the outcomes of this study.		No change	The Council will continue to engage with Transport for London when developing masterplans in the London Borough of Croydon.
0093/01/021/DM42/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment		DM42	Welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to reduce the impact of Fiveways and Purley Way on the Waddon area. Any such proposals must recognise the status of both the A23 and A232 as key strategic roads in south London. Under London Plan policy 6.11, any proposals brought forward here must recognise the urgent need to smooth traffic flow and reduce congestion and traffic levels.		No change	The Council will continue to engage with Transport for London when developing regeneration projects in the London Borough of Croydon.
0099/02/062/DM42/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM42	9 LSOAs in bottom 50%. Given the deprived nature of the area an area regeneration plan is called for which should encourage the creation of jobs at different levels. The CCG continues to support consideration of regeneration, redevelopment and collocation.		No change	Comment noted.
0110/01/001/DM42/S	Wm Morrison Supermarkets	Support		DM42	The 'Proposed' Fiveways Local Centre is supported as the area meets the definition of a Local centre set out in Appendix 1 (with the Morrison's 'Market Street' element providing a wide range of convenience goods). Furthermore, the area is well located to serve as a Local Centre and has considerable capacity for linked trips. Finally, the proposed Local Centre benefits from good accessibility to public transport.		No change	
0114/01/003/DM42/O	Mr Ian Walker Croydon Airport Society	Object		DM42	Policy is not deliverable in every area, with reference to Airport House and the former Gate House, Purley Way (DM42). DM17 does not show an understanding of the National and International historical significance of the former international airport, WWI RFC and WWII RAF airfield. This would benefit a full review.	Policy should show an understanding on the National and International historical significance of the former international airport, WW1 RFC and WWII RAF airfield.	Change	Paragraph 11.131 will be reworded in order to incorporate the former international airport, WWI RFC and WWII RAF airfield to read: 11.131Waddon has a fragmented character which consists of Retail Estates and Business and Leisure Parks and Industrial Estates along Purley Way and Local Authority Housing with Public Realm" on the Waddon Estate and large green open spaces of Duppas Hill, Wandle Park, Purley Way Playing Field, Roundshaw and the former international airport, WWI RFC and WWII RAF airfield. The local character is most consistent within the centre and becomes more inconsistent towards the northern and eastern edges of Waddon.

0114/01/005/DM42/O

Mr Ian Walker
Croydon Airport Society

Object

DM42

Airport House, the former Gate House, Roundshaw Playing Fields and Open Space would benefit from much greater heritage protection. This heritage is at great risk of loss to future generations due to lack of development and understanding. Development of the International Heritage Assest would be complaint with paragraph 6.113 and 6.115 and DM42 New Local Centre.

Greater heritage protection for the former Gate House, Roundshaw Playing Fields and Open Space.

No change

2 Using and commenting on this document

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0122/02/001/Key question a/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>		Support		Key question a	All preferable and very reasonable.		Welcome support	
0122/01/001/Key question a/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>		Support		Key question a	The preferred policy approach for all policies is the most appropriate to meet Strategic Objectives.		Welcome support	
0122/01/002/Key question b/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>		Support		Key question b	The preferred policy approach is deliverable for all policies.		Welcome support	
0122/02/002/Key question b/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>		Support		Key question b	There is every reason to suppose that preferred options are deliverable.		Welcome support	
0122/01/003/Key question c/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>		Support		Key question c	The preferred approach for all policies enables sustainable development.		Welcome support	
0122/02/003/Key question c/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>		Comment		Key question c	The preferred policy options seem to have been very well thought through and would definitely appear to enable sustainable development.		Welcome support	
0101/01/012/Key question d/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>		Object	Soundness - Justified	Key question d	The cottages in Elstan Way on the left as you enter St George's Church should be added to the list of local heritage areas (LASCs).	Designate the cottages as a local heritage area.	No change	All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015. The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).

0101/01/010/Key question d/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	Key question d	The cottages on the left hand side of Wickham Road on the exit from the Shirley Roundabout heading east, nearly opposite the Crown Public House should be added to the list of local heritage areas (LASC).	Designated the area as a local heritage area.	No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
------------------------------	--	--------	-----------------------	----------------	---	---	-----------	---

0105/01/042/Key question d/C	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Comment		Key question d	Cheston Avenue Conservation Area. The maisonettes were included on the map as a conservation area.	Cheston Avenue is part of a LASC, and is not a Conservation Area. Clarification needed of what is meant by 'the map'.	Change	<p>Cheston Avenue is currently a Local Area of Special Character, and is not a Conservation Area.</p> <p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
------------------------------	--	---------	--	----------------	--	---	--------	---

0112/01/004/Key question d/C	Mr Roy Colbran <i>Whitgift Estate Residents Associati</i>	Comment	Key question d	Nomination of the Whitgift Estate to be a Local Area of Special Character to be protected for future generations and as a unique part of Croydon's history. The area covered by the LASC would be Upfield, Grimwade Avenue, Sandilands, Fitzjames Avenue, Mapledale Avenue, Harland Avenue, Radcliffe Road (south of Harland Avenue), Ranmore Avenue, Deepdene Avenue (except for No.2) and Woodbury Close as well as houses on the south side of Addiscombe Road between The Shirley Park Golf Club and Woodbury Close.	Whitgift Estate to be a local heritage area. No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
0114/01/006/Key question d/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment	Key question d	Airport House and the former Airport Gate House, Purley Way to be designated as a Local Area of Special Character because the former Gate House is on the English Heritage "Heritage at Risk" Register ref 1079299 and both buildings are Grade II listed.	Airport House and Airport Gate House to be a local heritage area. No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>

0115/01/031/Key question d/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment	Key question d	LASCs: majority of housing stock on the Addiscombe Road, the majority of the Whitgift Estate and Ashburton Avenue. The Addiscombe Road is an artery leading into central Croydon and needs to be retained and protected to avoid the damage done to properties on other arteries, particularly to the north. The Whitgift Estate contains some properties of architectural merit and has a unique ambience within this part of Croydon.	Addiscombe Road, Whitgift Estate and Ashburton Avenue to be assessed for possible inclusion as local heritage areas	No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
------------------------------	----------------	---------	----------------	---	---	-----------	---

0117/01/001/Key question d/C	Mr Richard Applebee	Comment	Key question d	Wish for Box Ridge Avenue, Purley Rise and Hill Road to be give LASC status as Woodcote Road Valley Road and Monahan Avenue have already been give LASC status. An application has already previously been made to the Council.	Box Ridge Avenue, Purley Rise and Hill Road to be give LASC status.	No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
------------------------------	---------------------	---------	----------------	---	---	-----------	---

0120/01/169/Key
question d/S

ASPRA

Support

Key question d

Areas of heritage significance worthy of local designation:- The majority of housing stock on the Addiscombe Road,. Reason:-The Addiscombe Road is an artery leading into central Croydon and needs to be retained and protected to avoid the damage done to properties on other arteries, particularly to the north.

Add Addiscombe Road to areas to be reviewed.as possibly worthy of local heritage designation.

No change

All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.

The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).

Many of the residents would like the area covered by ASPRA (from Addiscombe to Lower Addiscombe Road & from Northampton Road to Shirley Road, with the addition of a few other areas that fit into no other RA's, & asked to join us), to become a conservation area, or certainly to be recognised as an area of local interest. It is true that many of the original windows & doors have now been replaced, and many of the porches filled in & front gardens paved over for cars, but still the overall structure & appearance of the houses & street lay-outs are retained, & perhaps official recognition of the area would prevent more problematic refurbishments or building. Protection may need to be given to the remaining original architectural styles & features. Residents are in general very proud of their area and keep it in good order to the best of their ability, merely adapting their properties to the necessities of modern life. Many residents have lived here for a long time: thirty to fifty years is not uncommon, which surely illustrates their contentment. People raise their families here, caring for their children & then grand-children, & nowadays many are tastefully converting their attics to make room for extra guest space, or growing or additional family members. This does not normally interfere with the architectural "lines" or heights, as large windows are no longer permitted at the front of the roof, but only sky-lights are visible.

Some of the original variety of detailing is still visible on the fronts of the houses, & much of the attractive original stained glass may still be seen. There is a stained glass restorer in the area who has, for instance, returned many doors & side-panels to their original condition. The variety of stained glass adds greatly to the interest of the streets after dark.

Consider the area covered by ASPRA (from Addiscombe to Lower Addiscombe Road & from Northampton Road to Shirley Road, with the addition of a few other areas that fit into no other RA's, & asked to join us), to become a conservation area, or certainly to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local heritage designation.

No change

All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.

The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).

0120/01/170/Key question d/S	ASPRA	Support	Key question d	Areas of heritage significance worthy of local designation:- The majority of the Whitgift Estate. Reason: The Whitgift Estate contains some individual properties of architectural merit. It has an ambience unique within this part of Croydon.	Add the Whitgift Estate to the areas to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local heritage designation.	No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
------------------------------	-------	---------	----------------	--	---	-----------	---

0120/01/171/Key question d/S	ASPRA	Support	Key question d	Areas of heritage significance worthy of local designation:- Ashburton Avenue	Add Asburton Avenue to the areas to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local heritage designation.	No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
------------------------------	-------	---------	----------------	---	---	-----------	---

0121/01/001/Key question d/C	Tarsem Flora	Comment	Key question d	Oakwood Avenue and Purley Rise in Purley have applied for LASC designation. Both are supported by PWRA	Add Oakwood Avenue and Purley Rise to the areas to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local heritage designation.	No change	<p>All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015.</p> <p>The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p>
0122/02/004/Key question d/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski	Comment	Key question d	The areas between Northampton and Shirley Road and Addiscombe and Lower Addiscombe Road to become a conservation area.	Areas between Northampton and Shirley Road and Addiscombe and Lower Addiscombe Road to be a conservation area.	No change	<p>The designation of new conservation areas does not fall within the scope of plan making legislation. The area was reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). It does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).</p> <p>The conclusions from the local heritage area review mean that the area represents very limited potential significance to merit conservation area designation.</p>

0122/02/005/Key question d/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	Key question d	Ashburton Park, Old Library Building and Pavilion to be considered.	Ashburton Park, Old Library Building and the Pavillion to be a LASC.	No change	All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015. The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).
0122/03/003/Key question d/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	Key question d	Ashburton Park is an under used and under valued asset with historic significance and current potential as a very attractive local amenity. The additional pond would be wonderful.	Add Ashburton Park to areas to be reviewed as an area of heritage significance worthy of local designation.	No change	Ashburton Park is already on the local list of historic parks and gardens.
0122/01/004/Key question d/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	Key question d	Would like the area covered by ASPRA, which is from Addiscombe to Lower Addiscombe Road and from Northampton Road to Shirley Road, with the addition of a few other areas that do not fit into any other Resident Associations, to become a conservation area or to be recognised as an area of local interest.	The area covered by ASPRA to become a conservation area or to be recognised as an area of local interest.	No change	All representations for proposed local heritage areas put forward during this consultation were reviewed alongside all existing local areas of special character during Summer 2014 against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") for policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). Those areas that meet the criteria will be proposed as new local heritage areas and consulted on in late 2015, accompanied by an evidence base for each proposed local heritage area and reviewed.

0124/01/001/Key question d/O	Mr JC Power <i>Oakwood Avenue Residents</i>	Object		Key question d	Oakwood Avenue should be designated as a Local Area of Special Character Also- strong objection to any form of back filling, garden-grabbing or cul-de-sac per se, and to any other development that would be out of character.	Designate Oakwood Avenue as a Local Area of Special Character	No change	All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015. The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review). Local character is defined in the wider context by buildings and surrounding land including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc.. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page 255 and non-residential character typologies are included in Appendix 10, page 289. The areas of consistent character are sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and
0101/01/008/Key question e/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	Key question e	Shirley Windmill should be added to the list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	Add Shirley Windmill to the list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	No change	The Shirley Windmill is already a Grade II Listed Building
0101/01/009/Key question e/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	Key question e	The cottages on the left hand side of Wickham Road on the exit from the Shirley Roundabout heading east, nearly opposite the Crown Public House should be added to the list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	Add the cottages to the list of buildings of architectural or historical significance.	No change	The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance

0101/01/011/Key question e/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	Key question e	The cottages in Elstan Way on the left as you enter St George's Church should be added to the list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	Add the cottages to the list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	No change	There is no change to the document. The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance.
0101/01/013/Key question e/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	Key question e	The cottages on the left hand side of Wickham Road on the exit from the Shirley Roundabout heading east, nearly opposite the Crown Public House should be added to the list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	Add the cottages to the list of buildings of architectural or historical significance.	No change	There is no change to the document. The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance
0105/01/041/Key question e/C	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Comment		Key question e	Additional Heritage Sites Shirley Windmill The cottages on the left hand side of Wickham Road on the exit from the Shirley Roundabout heading east, nearly opposite the Crown Public House. They are not currently recognised anywhere. The cottages in Elstan Way - again these cottages are on the left as you enter St. Georges Church and we believe they are really worthy of including on the list The Gate House in Wickham Road located at the corner of Wickham Road and Cheston Avenue - again we think this is also worthy of including.	Shirley Windmill, the cottages on the left hand side of Wickham Road and on Elstan Way and the Gate House in Wickham Road should be heritage sites.	No change	The Shirley Windmill is already a Grade II Listed Building. The recommendations for the other sites have been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance.
0115/01/032/Key question e/C	Mr Bob Sleeman	Comment		Key question e	Local list of buildings of architectural or historical significance: Carlyle Road, Cheyne Walk and Whitethorn Gardens contain fine examples of substantial Edwardian housing that has not in general been sub-divided. Ashburton Avenue is of historic and literary interest through the work of Delderfield. It contains fine examples of terraced housing with many retaining their period architectural detail and is in danger of destruction by inappropriate window replacement and loft conversions.	Carlyle Road, Cheyne Walk, Whitethorn Gardens and Ashburton Avenue to be assessed as part of any review of the local list of buildings of architectural or historical significance.	No change	These recommendations have been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance.
0120/01/175/Key question e/S	<i>ASPRA</i>	Support		Key question e	Local List of Buildings- Add Ashburton Avenue-Ashburton Avenue if of historic and literary interest through the work of Delderfield. It contains fine examples of terraced housing with many retaining their period architectural detail. It is in danger of destruction by inappropriate window replacement and loft conversions.	Add Ashburton Avenue housing -to the buildings to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local list designation.	No change	The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance
0120/01/174/Key question e/S	<i>ASPRA</i>	Support		Key question e	Local List of Buildings- Add Whitethorn Gardens- The road contains fine examples of substantial Edwardian housing that has not in general been sub-divided.	Add Whitethorne Gardens housing -to the buildings to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local list designation.	No change	The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance

0120/01/172/Key question e/S	ASPRA	Support	Key question e	Local List of Buildings- Add Carlyle Road- The road contains fine examples of substantial Edwardian housing that has not in general been sub-divided.	Add Carlyle Road housing-to the buildings to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local list designation.	No change	The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance
0120/01/173/Key question e/S	ASPRA	Support	Key question e	Local List of Buildings- Add Cheyne Walk- The road contains fine examples of substantial Edwardian housing that has not in general been sub-divided.	Add Cheyne Walk housing -to the buildings to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local list designation.	No change	The recommendation has been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance.
0122/03/004/Key question e/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	Key question e	Yes- the following should be included on the local list of buildings of architectural or historic significance:- The Old Ashburton Library, Pavillion and Park- could all be marvellous.	The following should be included on the local list of buildings of architectural or historic significance:- The Old Ashburton Library, Pavillion and Park-	No change	The former Ashburton Library is already on the Council's List of Buildings of Architectural and Historic Significance. Ashburton Park is already on the Council's Local List of Historic Parks and Gardens. The pavillion will be added to the list of recommendations for the next review of the local list.
0122/04/001/Key question e/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	Key question e	With respect to the wish for many people in the area that Addiscombe and Shirley Park could be made into a Conservation Area, or "Area of Special Local Interest" it may be worthwhile to note that many of the buildings, houses and residential streets were designed in the "Arts and Crafts" manner and period, and that this movement and philosophy has influenced much of their design, and what still remains evident of this style is part of what continues to make them so attractive today. Many are now 100 years old or more, but mostly in good order and well-maintained, regarded with great affection by their occupants, and mostly still retaining many of their original characteristics as to architectural construction, decoration and detailing.	Recommendation for Addiscombe and Shirley Park to be made into a conservation area or local heritage area.	No change	All representations put forward during this consultation for new local heritage areas were reviewed during summer 2014 alongside all existing local areas of special character against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas (LHA) set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") in policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). The evidence base document of this review has been produced and will support consultation on the local heritage areas designations in late 2015. The proposed area does not meet the criteria for designation as LHA as set out in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Partial Review).
0122/02/006/Key question e/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	Key question e	The Old Library Building, Ashburton Park and Pavillion are very attractive and historic and could be put to advantageous public and private use. The gardens could be improved, with a pond or lake added.	Old Library Building, Ashburton Park and Pavillion added to the local list of buildings of architectural or historic significance.	No change	The former Ashburton Library building is already on the Local List, and Ashburton Park is a Locally Listed Park and Garden. The pavillion will be added to the list of recommendations for the next review of the local list.

0122/01/005/Key question e/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Comment	Key question e	Would like the area covered by ASPRA, which is from Addiscombe to Lower Addiscombe Road and from Northampton Road to Shirley Road, with the addition of a few other areas that do not fit into any other Resident Associations, to become a conservation area or to be recognised as an area of local interest.	The area covered by ASPRA to become a conservation area or to be recognised as an area of local interest.	No change	All representations for proposed local heritage areas put forward during this consultation were reviewed alongside all existing local areas of special character during Summer 2014 against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") for policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). Those areas that meet the criteria will be proposed as new local heritage areas and consulted on in late 2015, accompanied by an evidence base for each proposed local heritage area and reviewed.
0101/01/035/Key question f/C	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Comment	Key question f	Note that Temple Avenue Copse has not been classified as Site of Nature Conservation Importance. This classification should be applied in addition to it being a natural and semi-natural opens space as there is a badger sett here which, to our knowledge, is still active.	Temple Avenue Copse should be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.	Change	Temple Avenue Copse will be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0108/01/004/Key question f/C	Mr Martin Mance	Comment	Key question f	I suggest this is worthy of consideration as a site of nature conservation importance - Spring-fed stream and pond in Lloyd Park (TQ338649)	Assess this site as a possible Site of Nature Conservation Importance-Spring-fed stream and pond in Lloyd Park (TQ338649)	Change	This site will be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0108/01/005/Key question f/C	Mr Martin Mance	Comment	Key question f	I suggest this is worthy of consideration as a site of nature conservation importance - Pond near junction between Mapledale Avenue and Upfield, Addiscombe (TQ345654)	Assess this site as a possible Site of Nature Conservation Importance-ond near junction between Mapledale Avenue and Upfield, Addiscombe (TQ345654)	Change	This site will be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0108/01/001/Key question f/C	Mr Martin Mance	Comment	Key question f	I suggest this is worthy of consideration for a site of nature conservation importance - Heathfield Ecology Centre - orchard, ponds and wildlife area (grid ref: TQ355636).	Assess this site as a possible Site of Nature Conservation Importance-Heathfield Ecology Centre - orchard, ponds and wildlife area (grid ref: TQ355636).	Change	This site will be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0108/01/002/Key question f/C	Mr Martin Mance	Comment	Key question f	I suggest this is worthy of consideration for sites of nature conservation importance- Heathfield - small area of old broadleaf woodland near Heathfield Farm (TQ353637)	Assess this site as a possible Site of Nature Conservation Importance-Heathfield - small area of old broadleaf woodland near Heathfield Farm (TQ353637)	Change	This site will be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0108/01/006/Key question f/C	Mr Martin Mance	Comment	Key question f	I suggest this is worthy of consideration as a site of nature conservation - Hamsey Green Pond (TQ350596)	Assess this site as a possible Site of Nature Conservation Importance-Hamsey Green Pond (TQ350596)	Change	This site will be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.

0108/01/003/Key question f/C	Mr Martin Mance	Comment	Key question f	I suggest this is worthy of consideration for a site of nature conservation importance - Abandoned railway line between Coombe Road and Croydon Road, particularly as a wildlife corridor (TQ334644)	Assess this site as a possible Site of Nature Conservation Importance- Abandoned railway line between Coombe Road and Croydon Road, particularly as a wildlife corridor (TQ334644)	No change	This site is already a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0120/01/029/Key question f/C	ASPRA	Comment	Key question f	Behind 104 Ashburton Avenue, Addiscombe, CRO 5PQ, we have been notified that a habitat where nightingales have been coming every year, where they sing "liquidly & melodiously" in the night, may be in danger. Some trees that they use may already have been trimmed or cut down, & some more may be in danger of being so, or "pollarded". Other gardens back onto this site, & also a scout hut. The owner of 104 Ashburton Avenue may be contacted for further details & access.	Behind 104 Ashburton Avenue, Addiscombe, CRO 5PQ is a possible nature area.- Add to list.	No change	This site is too small to be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0122/03/005/Key question f/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Support	Key question f	The following site would be worthy of protection as a Site of Nature Conservation- 104 Ashburton Avenue, Addiscombe, CR0 5PQ. Every year nightingales come to sing in the gardens behind this house. I understand that some of the trees have already been cut down and others are in danger of being pollarded or else cut down. Please advise how to save the nightingales or help with this.	Add the following site to those to be reviewed as worthy of protection as a Site of Nature Conservation- 104 Ashburton Avenue, Addiscombe, CR0 5PQ.	No change	This site is too small to be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0122/01/006/Key question f/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Comment	Key question f	Nightingales are present in the trees at 104 Ashburton Avenue, Addiscombe and the trees may be endangered.	The trees at 104 Ashburton Avenue should be protected.	No change	This site is too small to be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0122/02/007/Key question f/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA	Comment	Key question f	Cutting down or back of trees at 104 Ashburton Avenue may result in the loss of nightingale habitat.	104 Ashburton Avenue to be included as the local list of Sites of Nature Conservation.	No change	This site is too small to be designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0115/01/033/Key question g/S	Mr Bob Sleeman	Support	Key question g	More likely to maintain community facilities where the users have made significant investment.	Comment noted		
0120/01/176/Key question g/S	ASPRA	Support	Key question g	Agree the council's preferred approach is the most appropriate for the development of new community facilities as detailed in paragraph 7.7. We are more likely to maintain community facilities, where the users have made significant investment. This has been demonstrated by the Faith communities in 'Addiscombe'.		Welcome support	
0121/01/003/Key question g/O	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Object	Key question g	We would recommend that the council should be proactive in promoting community facilities	The Council should promote Community facilities and be more proactive in this.	No change	It is considered that Policy DM18 will promote community facilities.

0122/01/007/Key question g/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	Key question g	The preferred approach is the most appropriate for the development of community facilities.		Welcome support	
0122/03/006/Key question g/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	Key question g	This seems to provide a good solution.		Welcome support	
0122/02/008/Key question g/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	Key question g	Most appropriate and reasonable approach.		Welcome support	
0184/01/002/Key question g/O	Mr David Lewis	Object	Key question g	Disagree with approach for development of new community facilities detailed in paragraph 7.7.1 find it difficult to imagine how the council can plan community facilities without the continued presence of the Purley pool and Gymnasium. It will be symbiotic with Purley Hospital in maintaining the good health of the local residents. Many of the users are there for health and mobility reasons and exercise, particularly in water is vital to their continued mobility. Some would not be able to travel to the new facilities at Waddon without using a car and adding considerably to the traffic on the Purley way. Not all people can drive to their exercise, some come by bus or other transport. Some visit on the way to the station for their commute to work.	Purley pool and gymnasium need to be retained.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

3 Strategic Context

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0003/05/001/Non-specific/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>		Support			Welcomes the vision and the Council's aspiration to secure a 'Sustainable City', where the natural environment forms the arteries and veins of the city.		Welcome support	Note support although the Strategic Objectives were set in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and are not subject to consultation.
0003/05/003/Non-specific/C	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>		Comment			To deliver Natural Environment policies the Council may find that the use of existing natural signage of the borough can be used to help deliver this objective. Natural signage refers to the underlying landscape of an area which can make a direct and powerful contribution to a sense of place and local distinctiveness. An example of this is Wandle Valley Regional Park which has a natural signage of water meadows echoing the meandering course of the river, back by bands of wet woodlands. Natural England has produced a London Landscape Framework which gives further guidance on the natural signatures, which includes a section on the Wandle River valley.	Recommend the council refers to the London Landscape Framework and consider its inclusion within this section of the development plan document.	No change	Natural signatures are referenced in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies which were adopted in April 2013.

0113/11/002/Non-specific/O

Mobile Operators Association

Object

Consider it important that a telecommunications policy remains within the emerging LDF. It is recognised that telecommunications plays a vital role in both the economic and social fabric of communities. The formulation of policy does not exist in isolation and there are numerous documents which will affect the formulation of any telecommunications policy, the most important being the NPPF. Within the LDF there should be a concise and flexible telecommunications policy contained within one of the statutory documents, which would give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues which development will be assessed against. It should be a stand alone policy, with any background information, such as electromagnetic fields and public health, being contained within a separate Supplementary Planning Document, which can be read with the guidance in the NPPF and the Code of Best Practice to Mobile Phone Network Development to give a comprehensive background to any proposed development.

We would suggest a policy which reads; Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -
 (i) the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;
 (ii) if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building;
 (iii) if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.
 (iv) If proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.
 When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks and the technical limitations of the technology.

Change

A policy on Telecommunications will be added to the Plan.

We would consider it appropriate to introduce the policy and we would suggest the following;
 "Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document"

0003/05/006/Strategic Objectives/S

Mr David Hammond
 Natural England

Support

Strategic Objectives

Strategic Objective 4: new development to integrate, respect and enhance the Borough's natural environment is supported.

Welcome support

Note support although the Strategic Objectives were set in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and are not subject to consultation.

0003/05/005/Strategic Objectives/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	Strategic Objectives	Strategic Objective 4: reducing environmental deprivation is supported.	Welcome support	Note support although the Strategic Objectives were set in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and are not subject to consultation.
0003/05/007/Strategic Objectives/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	Strategic Objectives	Strategic Objective 10: Improve quality and accessibility of green space and nature, whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity is supported.	Welcome support	Note support although the Strategic Objectives were set in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and are not subject to consultation.

4 Homes

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0105/01/007/4.010/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa		Object		4.010	Amenity space is closely related to housing density which is referred to in greater detail in DM2 . Paragraph 4.10's reference to London Housing Design Guide and amenity space defined in terms of balconies roof terraces, decks and gardens, and the assumption of back gardens to be 9m deep, with gardens that end at a communal space to be 5m deep and front privacy zones 1.5m deep, is acceptable for inner city and urban but not acceptable in suburban or the "Shirley Place"	The amenity spaces should reflect what is acceptable in suburban places.	Change	The Preferred Option for the private and communal amenity space policy (formerly Policy DM1), will be combined with the policy on design and character (DM11) to make it clear that local character is a consideration in the quantum of amenity space. The London Plan is the minimum space requirements for the private amenity space. All flatted developments and development of ten or more houses must also provide private amenity and play space as calculated from the policy's Table. The policy needs to be read with all the Local Plan policies which will guide the amount of amenity space expected from new developments. The supporting text to the preferred option states that 'evidence will be required to demonstrate that privacy is protected and the character of the area in the layout of private and communal amenity space as part of development proposals'. It also states that there should be a minimum separation of 18-21m between directly facing habitable rooms on main rear elevations as a best practice yardstick, and should be applied flexibly dependent on the development's context.
0121/01/004/4.010/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA		Comment		4.010	We agree with paragrraph 4.10 and 4.11, but have noted in the past the council has not adhered to its standards on amenity spaces.		Welcome support	

0105/01/008/4.011/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	4.011	<p>The London Housing Design Guide in 5.1.1 Standards states " by setting a minimum distance of 18-21m between facing homes- It says that these are still useful yardsticks for visual privacy, but adhering rigidly to these measures can limit the variety of urban spaces and housing types in the city, and can sometimes unnecessarily restrict density".</p> <p>Why state it can unnecessarily restrict density. The distance between facing windows should reflect the spacing of the surrounding properties, otherwise the proposed development will not reflect the character of the surrounding area.</p>	Remove "can sometimes unnecessarily restrict density". The distance between facing windows should reflect the spacing of surrounding properties, otherwise the proposed development will not reflect the character of the surrounding area.	Change	<p>The paragraph has been amended in the policy to state that the distance of 18-21m between facing habitable rooms is a best practice 'yardstick' in common usage and should be applied flexibly dependent on the context of development to ensure development is provided at an acceptable density. The sentence 'can sometimes unnecessarily restrict density' has been removed. Proposed development will be considered in the context of all the policies of the Local Plan. The Preferred Option for the private and communal amenity space policy (formerly Policy DM1), will be combined with the policy on design and character (DM11) to make it clear that local character is a consideration in the quantum of amenity space to residential developments.</p>
0121/01/005/4.011/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Comment	4.011	We agree with paragraph 4.10 and 4.11, but have noted in the past the council has not adhered to its standards on amenity spaces.		Welcome support	
0130/01/003/4.027/C	The Croydon Partnership	Comment	4.027	<p>The draft policy is supported by explanatory text at Paragraphs 4.13 to 4.32 of the consultation document. Paragraph 4.27 states that, in exceptional cases in the COA, where it is impossible as part of new flatted development to provide all dwellings with sufficient private amenity space, up to 5% of the units may instead be provided with more internal floor area equivalent to the under provision of the minimum private amenity space standards in line with the Mayor of London's Housing SPG. We are, however, unsure whether the reference to 5% exists in the SPG in question and would ask that the Council provide clarification on this point.</p>	Clarify where the 5% comes from in paragraph 4.27	Change	<p>The 5% is not in the Mayor's Housing SPG, although it was in the Interim London Housing Design Guide. However Paragraph 2.3.26 of the Mayor's Housing SPG states that ' In exceptional circumstances, where site constraints make it impossible to provide private open space for dwellings, a proportion of dwellings may instead be provided with additional internal living space equivalent to the area of the private open space requirement. This area must be added to the minimum GIA and minimum living area of the dwelling, and may be added to living rooms or may form a separate living room. ' This paragraph will be amended and the reference to 5% removed to align with the Mayor's Housing SPG. The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan.</p>

0118/11/003/4.098/S		Support	4.098	The reference to the CIL and Social Housing Relief is noted.		Welcome support	
	<i>Redrow Homes</i>						
0026/02/001/DM1 (Option 1)/O	<i>Berkeley Homes PLC</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective DM1 (Option 1)	Although the preferred policy approach for delivery of private and communal outdoor amenity space is supported it is desirable in further iterations of the policy to allow a flexible application of the space requirements on a site by site basis. There is a possibility of conflict with Policy DM24 (Supporting Paragraph 10.10) and issues between amenity space and design that would make it inappropriate to include balconies on particular elevations. It is suggested that a flexible policy would allow a fixed quantum of amenity space be provided elsewhere on a development.	Amend DM1 Option1 to avoid potential conflict with DM24 (Supporting Paragraph 10.10) and issues between amenity space and design that would make it inappropriate to include balconies on particular elevations. It is suggested that a flexible policy would allow a fixed quantum of amenity space be provided elsewhere on a development.	Change	The text has been amended to clarify what is meant by private and communal amenity space and that private space is for the individual unit and communal is accessible to all within the development and could be exclusive for the residents' use or could be a space such as a square that the public could also access. The text will make it clear that the private and communal amenity space may be pooled to create a communal amenity space for the development. The policy is flexible as balconies are an option for private amenity space and are not an automatic requirement. The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies.
0028/03/007/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	DM1 (Option 1)	DM1 Option 1: The policy approach does not enable sustainable development.		No change	The Council disagrees. The policy is aligned to the London Plan which has had a sustainability appraisal.
0028/03/003/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	DM1 (Option 1)	Many people do not want private outside amenity space as it needs managing and maintaining, therefore whilst the importance of urban open spaces such as gardens is recognised, it is not appropriate to every property and every development. A range of house sizes and types, with a range of plot sizes is most appropriate.	A range of house sizes and types, with a range of plot sizes is most appropriate.	Change	The Plan will be amended to make it clear that private amenity space does not have to be outdoors. The proposed policy when combined with the character based approach in Policy DM11 allows for a range of house sizes and types, with a range of plot sizes that is most appropriate. The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals.

0028/03/006/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object		DM1 (Option 1)	DM1 Option 1: the policy approach is not deliverable.		No change	The Council disagrees. The viability assessment of the preferred options did not identify an issue with this policy on private and communal amenity space.
0028/03/005/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM1 (Option 1)	The majority of this policy refers to development being of high quality design. There are other policies in the plan referring to design, which should provide sufficient policy in support of this. As such, this policy is unnecessary.	Rely on design policies.	Change	The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals.
0028/03/004/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object		DM1 (Option 1)	The Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance provides a similar level of detail to the policy and could be referred to in a Local Plan policy.	Refer to the Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.	Change	Compliance with the Mayor's Housing SPG is a requirement of Policy SP2 of the Croydon Local Plan. Areas of duplication will be removed from the policy. DM1 and DM11 will be combined. The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals.
0099/02/002/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM1 (Option 1)	The CCG considers that using "children living in the development" as a measure in option 1 is not a firm basis for planning, as it is a vague variable which is open to abuse.		Change	The Council disagrees. The reference to the number of children living in a development comes from the Mayor of London and is referred to in both the Mayor's Housing SPG and the Mayor's 'Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation'. A revised table is proposed for the preferred option for the private amenity and play space standards for flatted developments and all schemes of ten or more units, which calculates the amount of space required based on the unit size and numbers of children per unit and provides clarity on the quantity of space required. Note this is the minimum and each site will need to

0102/01/001/DM1 (Option 1)/O	<i>Joint LPA Receivers</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM1 (Option 1)	An additional policy is not needed as it replicates the Mayor's Housing SPG.	Change	The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and duplications of the Mayor's Housing SPG will be removed as much as possible.
					Option 1 does not provide sufficient flexibility and each case should be assessed on its merits.		

0105/01/002/DM1 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM1 (Option 1)	Option1 is not deliverable as developers need to explain how they will meet the requirements for confirming with the character of adjacent propoerties, the streetscene and the wider environment. There is a need to develop the Shirely Character Appraisal ro maintain character,amenity,housing density and roofscapes in Monks Orchard as more accurate character diescriptions will encourage more sympathetic compliance.We recommends that developers should explain how they meet the requirements for conforming with the character of adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider environment. This explanation should be presented within the developer's design and access statement.The developer should also explain how his proposals reflect the amenity requirements to complement that of adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area, within his design and access statement.	Developers should explain how they meet the requirements for conforming with the character of adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider environment within the Design and Access Statement. They should also explain how their proposals reflect the amentiy requirements to complement that of adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area.	Change	Developers will need to demonstrate how they comply with all the policies of the Croydon Local Plan. .The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals. The London Plan is the minimum space requirements for the private amenity space. All flatted developments and development of ten or more houses must also provide private amenity and play space as calculated from the policy's Table. The policy needs to be read with all the Local Plan policies which will guide the amount of amenity space expected from new developments.The supporting text to the preferred option states that `evidence will be required to demonstrate that privacy is protected and the character of the area in the layout of private and communal amenity space as part of development proposals`. It also states that there should be a minimum separation of 18-21m between directly facing habitable rooms on main rear elevations as a best practice yardstick, and should be applied flexibly dependent on the development's context.
---------------------------------	--	--------	--	----------------	--	---	--------	--

0105/01/001/DM1
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM1 (Option 1)

Object to Option 1 for the following reason
- that reduction of amenity space is inappropriate. Sites which have been developed including back garden and tandem developments have reduced the mix of house and garden types, increased housing densities, and degraded the character of Shirley Place and Monks Orchard in particular. The loss of needed bungalows has degraded the open nature of many of the streets in Croydon as skylines have been replaced with regular and less characterful two-storey houses and roofscapes.
- Housing needs have traditionally varied in Shirley due to its natural development over a sustained period. The character of the MORA area reflects the varied residential amenities. These variations in housing design and associated variations in house and garden size have dominated our area. There is a need for this variation. SHIRLEY IS NOT TYPICAL OF THE WHOLE OF CROYDON. The Shirley Character Appraisal also supports this referring to Shirley's age, ethnic and income distribution and the lower PTAL and higher dependency on cars than elsewhere.

Amenity space should not be reduced and should continue to be varied.

Change

The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals. The London Plan is the minimum space requirements for the private amenity space. All flatted developments and development of ten or more houses must also provide private amenity and play space as calculated from the policy's Table. The policy needs to be read with all the Local Plan policies which will guide the amount of amenity space expected from new developments. The supporting text to the preferred option states that 'evidence will be required to demonstrate that privacy is protected and the character of the area in the layout of private and communal amenity space as part of development proposals'. It also states that there should be a minimum separation of 18-21m between directly facing habitable rooms on main rear elevations as a best practice yardstick, and should be applied flexibly dependent on the development's context.

0105/01/003/DM1
(Option 1)/C

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Comment

DM1 (Option 1)

Clarification is required to establish the interpretation of: m2 and sq.metres. e.g is 9m2= 9sq.m and not 81m2!

Clarify the interpretation of m2 and sqmeters.

No change

Sq m and m2 are interchangeable. 9m2 = 9sq m.

0105/01/004/DM1
(Option 1)/C

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Comment

DM1 (Option 1)

This policy approach of Option 1 does not enable sustainable development. Sustainability is dependent upon the character and the residential amenity that the development offers. The Character Appraisal indicates that the Shirley Place has a different population mix than elsewhere in Croydon that has different needs. The amenity needs of Shirley Place will change with lifestyle changes and changes in interests. The proportion of retired individuals is predicted to increase dramatically.
The proposed policies will not encourage sustainability within Monks Orchard as the latter does not encourage the retention of existing housing densities. This can only be achieved by developing and improving the character appraisal and reducing infill, back garden and tandem developments and improving the control of permitted developments.

The policy should encourage the retention of existing housing densities, develop and improve the character appraisal, reduce infill, back garden and tandem developments and improve the control of permitted developments.

No change

If the policy were to do this it would not be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework. The Council cannot change Permitted Development rights. The proposed private and communal amenity space has been combined with the policies on design and character.

0105/01/006/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM1 (Option 1)	<p>Option 1 Table 4.1 does not allow minimum distance of back to back properties with facing windows to respect privacy .i.e. minimum 18 metres.</p> <p>The recognised terminology for area is depth x breadth = m2 thus for a 1 person property the amenity allocation is 5m2 = 1m x 5m or 5m x 1m (i.e. a pathway either width or depth of amenity) not 5m x 5m = 25m2.</p> <p>This would result in back to back properties with similar amenity to be either 2 metres or 10 metres distance. Something wrong here as this is more like the distance between side by side properties in a high housing density/hectare area.</p> <p>For the largest occupation of 4b6p the amenity space is quoted in Table 4.1 as 9m2 which is say 3m x 3m or a pathway of 9m x 1m so the max back to back distance between properties would just meet the 18 to 21m (*) separation if a 9m pathway of 9m x 1m for each of the two pathways the length of each amenity space - quite ridiculous.</p> <p>We believe you really mean the amenity would have a depth of 5m for a single person and 9m depth for a 6 person property with the amenity space the width of the property, but this too is inappropriate as it would not meet the character of our area. (*Note: For amenity in the city - See para 4.11 which references The London Housing Design Guide - 5.1.1 Standards.</p>	The calculations for the amenities should be addressed.	Change	<p>The Preferred Option for the private and communal amenity space policy (formerly Policy DM1), will be combined with the policy on design and character (DM11) to make it clear that local character is a consideration in the quantum of amenity space. The London Plan is the minimum space requirements for the private amenity space. All flatted developments and development of ten or more houses must also provide private amenity and play space as calculated from the policy's Table. The policy needs to be read with all the Local Plan policies which will guide the amount of amenity space expected from new developments. The supporting text to the preferred option states that 'evidence will be required to demonstrate that privacy is protected and the character of the area in the layout of private and communal amenity space as part of development proposals'. It also states that there should be a minimum separation of 18-21m between directly facing habitable rooms on main rear elevations as a best practice yardstick, and should be applied flexibly dependent on the development's context.</p>
0118/02/002/DM1 (Option 1)/S	Redrow Homes	Support	DM1 (Option 1)	<p>The minimum depth of balconies at 1.5m is noted and considered to accord with the requirements of the London Plan.</p>		No change	
0118/02/001/DM1 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object	DM1 (Option 1)	<p>Policy DM1 seeks to achieve the strategic objectives and the flexibility offered in the application of the preferred option is considered important. The provision of private open space within new developments cannot be achieved through a prescriptive application of standards and needs to be considered on a site by site basis. The minimum private amenity and play space provisions standards as set out in table 4.1 need to be applied on a site specific basis and interpreted on a case by case basis.</p>	Apply the minimum private amenity and play space provision standards on a site by site and case by case basis.	Change	<p>The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals. The Table has been revised to incorporate the amenity and play space standards and shows the minimum space requirements.</p>

0118/02/005/DM1 (Option 1)/S	Redrow Homes	Support		DM1 (Option 1)	DM1: the preferred policy approach enables sustainable development.		Welcome support	
0118/02/004/DM1 (Option 1)/S	Redrow Homes	Support		DM1 (Option 1)	DM1: The preferred policy approach is deliverable.		Welcome support	
0130/01/001/DM1 (Option 1)/S	The Croydon Partnership	Support		DM1 (Option 1)	We agree with Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') for draft Policy DM1.1 and DM1.3 (including the proposed minimum space standards as set out in Table 4.1),		Welcome support	The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character polies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals.
0130/01/002/DM1 (Option 1)/O	The Croydon Partnership	Object		DM1 (Option 1)	We consider that the proposed wording of draft Policy DM1.2 should be softened to allow for exceptions where it might not be possible to implement the communal outdoor amenity space fully. We therefore suggest the following re-wording to ensure that the Council is able to make a weighted decision on particular proposals that come forward when it may not be achievable for all units within a development: `All flatted developments should, where appropriate, in addition, provide communal outdoor amenity space that meets the requirements of DM1.1 and is overlooked by surrounding areas and, or development.` This proposed re-wording is in the best interests of the Council and will avoid the potential for objectors to a scheme on this basis.	Amend DM1.2 as follows`All flatted developments should, where appropriate, in addition, provide communal outdoor amenity space that meets the requirements of DM1.1 and is overlooked by surrounding areas and, or development.`	No change	The words 'where appropriate' are not used in policy wording in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies as they are vague and are open to interpretation. Developments proposals should accord with Plan once it is adopted unless there are material considerations otherwise. Each application will be treated on its merits including consideration of material considerations presented for any departure from adopted development plan policy. The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character polies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals.
0102/01/002/DM1 (Option 2)/S	Joint LPA Receivers	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM1 (Option 2)	There is no need for this policy therefore Option 2 is supported.		Change	Welcome the comments on the alternative option, however following all comments, the Preferred Option will be combined with the policy on Desing and character and this will help to make it clear that lharacter is a consideration in the quantum of amenity space.

0118/02/003/DM1 (Option 2)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM1 (Option 2)	Option 2 standards and approach are not supported and would not provide sufficient account for site specific circumstances to influence development form.	Take forward Option 1.	Welcome support	Welcome support for not using Option 2.
0099/02/001/DM1 (Option 3)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM1 (Option 3)	The CCG supports option 3 which sets clear minimum standards for private and communal outdoor amenity space.		No change	Welcome the comments on the alternative option, however following all comments, the policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals. The minimum standards of Option 3 entailed the selection of an average for amenity space sizes that would not assist with the sensitivity of development to local character.
0105/01/005/DM1 (Option 3)/S	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Support		DM1 (Option 3)	We prefer Option3 as any reference to Table 4.1 is inappropriate Our preferred Option is Option 3 (which does not refer to Table 4.1 but) provides private amenity outdoor space of a minimum of 45m2 per residential dwelling but should be as appropriate for the character of the area. Amenity space depends on the surrounding character of the area and is different across the borough depended on locality-to define a specific amount would therefore be unacceptable in Ashburton and Shirley wards. The Housing Density in house units/hectare should reflect that of immediately adjacent properties. Properties north of Wickham Road are predominantly - Detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows with medium to large gardens so Table 4.1 is totally inappropriate for the character of our part of the Shirley Place.		Change	Welcome the comments on the alternative option, however following all comments, the Preferred Option for the private and communal amenity space policy (formerly Policy DM1), will be combined with the policy on design and character (DM11) to make it clear that local character is a consideration in the quantum of amenity space. Minimum standards of Option 3 entailed the selection of an average for amenity space sizes that would not assist with the sensitivity of development to local character. The supporting text to the preferred option states that 'evidence will be required to demonstrate that privacy is protected and the character of the area in the layout of private and communal amenity space as part of development proposals'. It also states that there should be a minimum separation of 18-21m between directly facing habitable rooms on main rear elevations as a best practice yardstick, and should be applied flexibly dependent on the development's context.

0121/01/006/DM1 (Option 3)/S	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Support	DM1 (Option 3)	We prefer Option3 which gives a better safeguard and sets out minimum standards.	Select Option3 for DM1 as the preferred approach.	No change	Welcome the comments on the alternative option, however following all comments, the Preferred Option for Policy DM1 on Amenity will be combined with the Design and character policies to make it clear that context is a consideration in the quantum of amenity space. Minimum standards of Option 3 entailed the selection of an average for amenity space sizes that would not assist with the sensitivity of development to local character.
0118/09/002/DM1 (Table 4.1)/S	 Redrow Homes	Support	DM1 (Table 4.1)	The exclusions to the calculation of outdoor amenity spaces are noted. The inclusion of balconies within private amenity calculation is supported as a pragmatic approach to open space provision.			Welcome support
0118/09/004/DM1 (Table 4.1)/S	 Redrow Homes	Support	DM1 (Table 4.1)	DM1 Table 4.1: the preferred policy approach enables sustainable development.			Welcome support
0118/09/003/DM1 (Table 4.1)/S	 Redrow Homes	Support	DM1 (Table 4.1)	DM1 Table 4.1: The preferred policy approach is deliverable.			Welcome support
0118/09/001/DM1 (Table 4.1)/C	 Redrow Homes	Comment	DM1 (Table 4.1)	The flexibility in the preferred option in the application of the policy is considered important. The provision of private open space within new developments cannot be achieved through a prescriptive application of standards and needs to be considered on a site by site and case by case basis.	The minimum private amenity and play space provisions standards as set out in table 4.1 and paragraph 4.22 need to be applied on a site specific basis and interpreted on a case by case basis.	Change	The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals. The Table has been revised to incorporate the amenity and play space standards and shows the minimum space requirements.

0026/02/002/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Berkeley Homes PLC	Object	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM2 (Option 1)	The policy is consistent with national policy and the approach is deliverable and sustainable but the policy should be reworded to provide a much more flexible approach to ensure that targets in Table 4.2 are applied flexibly and reflect individual site circumstances and the viability of particular developments.	Reword Policy DM2 to be more flexible with targets in Table 4.2 applied flexibly.	Change	The policy on private and communal space for developments, has been moved to the Design and character policies section DM11 of the Local Plan, to make it clearer that this policy is to be applied in conjunction with design and character policies and that the context of the development should be respected in design proposals. The Table has been revised to incorporate the amenity and play space standards and shows the minimum space requirements and conforms with the Mayor's Housing SPG and is the minimum that would be required in Croydon. There is flexibility as to how it can be applied, as explained in the section 'How the preferred Option would work'.
0028/03/002/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen White & Sons	Object		DM2 (Option 1)	Question whether there is sufficient demand for 3 bedroom flats and therefore whether this policy will act as a constraint on development and restrict the viability of some flatted schemes. This could affect deliverability of residential development in the Croydon area.	Assess the demand for three bedroom flats in Croydon.	Change	There is an established need for 3-bedroom properties in Croydon as evidenced by the Local Housing Market Assessment and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. An assessment was carried out to check whether the proposed policy will achieve the borough's strategic targets for larger homes, using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. The strategic target for three bedroom or more, homes in the borough outside of the Croydon Opportunity Area has been revised to 50% in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies - Partial Review. Additional supporting text is proposed to the policy for 'Housing Choice for sustainable communities' which reflects that there may be a transitional period whilst the market adapts to the of three bedroom homes to the percentage required.

0028/03/001/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	Whilst the basis of the policy is understandable and supported in principle, constraining development in this way can have unintended consequences of development being out of keeping with the character of the area. This policy should be considered carefully alongside design policies.	Consider this policy alongside design policies.	No change	The points made are noted. The Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies-Partial Review proposes the strategic target for 50% of all new homes to have 3 or more bedrooms in line with the need for homes of this size. If left to the market this target will not be met. The approach set out in proposed Policy 'Housing choice for sustainable communities' seeks to influence new development proposals to help meet this target whilst still respecting the character of each Place. Policies SP1 and SP4 both require good quality design and all development proposals should have regard to these policies (alongside DM11-'Design and character' should it be adopted).
0093/01/001/DM2 (Option 1)/C	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	Table 4.2 does not fully reflect the requirements of the Croydon Opportunity Area and in particular the requirement for a minimum of 45% residential units to be 3 bedroom or larger	Table 4.2 should reflect the requirements of the Croydon Opportunity Area and in particular the requirement for a minimum of 45% residential units to be 3 bedroom or larger	No change	The Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework is SPG to the London Plan and SPD to the Croydon Local Plan and cannot set policy targets itself. Table 4.2, now renumbered Table 4.1, sets borough wide requirements and to avoid a confusing set of figures a slightly lower figure has been chosen as this is likely to work on a borough wide basis. It would be odd for the Opportunity Area to have a higher figure than any other Urban with a high Public Transport Accessibility Level location in the borough.
0099/02/003/DM2 (Option 1)/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Effective DM2 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1. Council may want to reflect on possible negative impact of Option 1 on SP4.2 (c) - social cohesion and well-being, in terms of (1) very high population density in town centres, and (2) high turnover of occupants and very low retention of families in town centres. (Cf. Detailed Policies p. 10 which refers to the "family friendly" ethos of the Metropolitan Centre.)		No change	The comment is noted, however, the percentage requirement for three bed homes in the Croydon Metropolitan Centre aligns with the Opportunity Area Planning Framework and the London Plan 2015'S (Para 3.29) statement that provision of higher density provision for smaller households should be focussed on areas with good public transport accessibility and that lower density housing is generally most appropriate for family housing.

0102/01/003/DM2 (Option 1)/O	<i>Joint LPA Receivers</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM2 (Option 1)	The wording of this policy is currently too inflexible and could hinder development. Therefore, object to Option 1. Suggest the words 'where appropriate' be added to provide flexibility.	No change	The words 'where appropriate' are not used in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies as they are vague. Developments proposals should accord with Plan once it is adopted unless there are material considerations otherwise. Each application will be treated on its merits including consideration of material considerations presented for any departure from adopted development plan policy.	
0103/01/004/DM2 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Option 1)	Policy seeks to ensure that a significant amount of new housing located outside of the Croydon Opportunity Area is delivered as three or more bedroom units, with housing development concentrated on brownfield sites. These are likely to be small central brownfield sites, where flatted development is likely to be proposed. It is unrealistic to think that developers will be willing to build three bedroom flats as they do not sell, and this therefore undermines the policy aim.	Question the delivery of this policy as it is unrealistic to think that developers will be willing to build three bedroom flats as they do not sell.	No change	The policy is deliverable in the future as the housing market responds to the pressure for 3 bed homes. Croydon's Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 and the London Strategic Housing Market Assessment both identify a need for 3 and 4-bedroom homes in Croydon and London respectively. As London is constrained by Metropolitan Green Belt and other policy designations it will not be possible in the future to meet the need for larger homes just using a traditional typology such as town houses or semi-detached or detached suburban homes with gardens. Therefore, the market and development industry will have to adapt reflecting supply and demand such that it is very likely that products such as 3-bedroom flats will become more common and more acceptable to buy or rent. When combined with the Croydon Local Plan's proposed policies on private amenity space in flatted developments these flats will be suitable and more desirable for families who traditionally have preferred a house with a garden.
0103/01/001/DM2 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Option 1)	DM2 option 1: The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate to meet the Strategic Objectives.		No change	The comment is noted, however there is justification for the policy and evidence of need for 3 bed homes from the Croydon Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 which looks forward to 2036.

0103/01/003/DM2
(Option 1)/O

Persimmon Homes

Object

DM2 (Option 1)

Support the Council's approach to provide more family homes in accordance with Croydon's SMHA. However, the plan period is up to 2031 and in that period there may be changes to household constitution requiring either more or less family homes to be built.

The supporting text or the policy itself states that requirements are subject to reviews of the SHMA to ensure that a mix of housing is provided to 2031, with the following text:
"Development should provide a mix of housing sites, types and tenures to meet the needs of the District's communities as shown in policy DM2 or as evidence in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (whichever is the later), in order to create sustainable and balance communities".

No change

The Strategic Market Housing Assessment of 2015 covers the period up to 2036. Should a Strategic Market Assessment be updated subsequent to the adoption of this Plan it would either trigger a review of planning policy or else would be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. This is the default position for all new evidence that is published after a Plan is adopted and it is not necessary to reference a specific type of evidence within the reasoned justification for this particular policy.

0103/01/002/DM2
(Option 1)/O

Persimmon Homes

Object

DM2 (Option 1)

DM2 Option 1: Preferred policy approach is not deliverable.

No change

The comment is noted, however the policy is deliverable in the future as the housing market responds to the pressure for 3 bed homes. The policy is deliverable in the future as the housing market responds to the pressure for 3 bed homes. Croydon's Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 and the London Strategic Housing Market Assessment both identify a need for 3 and 4-bedroom homes in Croydon and London respectively. As London is constrained by Metropolitan Green Belt and other policy designations it will not possible in the future to meet the need for larger homes just using a traditional typology such as town houses or semi-detached or detached suburban homes with gardens. Therefore, the market and development industry will have to adapt reflecting supply and demand such that it is very likely that products such as 3-bedroom flats will become more common and more acceptable to buy or rent. When combined with the Croydon Local Plan's proposed policies on private amenity space in flatted developments these flats will be suitable and more desirable for families who traditionally have preferred a house with a garden.

Overtime the market and development industry will need to adapt to meet this need. New forms of development will come forward to meet this need and in response to supply and demand high density living will become more of the accepted mode of habitation for families. The Croydon Local Plan proposed preferred policy options are looking to this future with detailed policies to ensure the quality of life is maintained in this type of development.

0103/01/005/DM2 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The Plan notes that an assessment of windfalls will be made in areas outside the Croydon Opportunity Area in order for these to contribute to the overall housing target. The policy would not apply to these developments as these sites are likely to be small and would fall below the threshold set out of ten or more dwellings. Whilst the highest levels proposed in the policy (in some cases up to 80% of dwellings should be provided as three bed or more), there is no current evidence whether this would create sufficient supply to meet the target of 60%.	Council should revisit this figure when the data is available (e.g. when the updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has been carried out).	No change	An assessment was carried out to check whether the proposed policy will achieve the borough's strategic targets for larger homes, using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. The strategic target for three bedroom or more, homes in the borough outside of the Croydon Opportunity Area has been revised to 50% in the Croydon Local Plan:Strategic Policies - Partial Review.
0103/01/006/DM2 (Option 1)/C	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	The Council should consider whether sites with a high PTAL, but located on undeveloped sites could contribute a higher percentage of family housing than previously developed sites, and these may be essential in meeting the target.	Consider sites undeveloped sites with high PTALs.	No change	There is a general presumption that almost all development sites will be previously developed. It is unnecessary to provide a specific target for the few exceptions.
0105/01/014/DM2 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	There should also be minimum room sizes and storage space: See London Plan:	Minimum room sizes and storage space should be added.	No change	These are already a requirement of Policy SP2.6 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. The Technical Housing Standards-nationally prescribed space standards will be implemented in October 2015 and all development will need to adhere to these standards which specify minimum room sizes and storage space.
0105/01/016/DM2 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	Residential development should have regard to the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction (also see Chapter 4A).	Residential development should have regard to the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction	No change	The policy on 'Sustainable Design and Construction' aligns with the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction.

0105/01/009/DM2
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM2 (Option 1)

2.2:Strategic Objective3: Provide a choice of housing for people at all stages of life.
The Shirley Character Appraisal states that Shirley Place has a higher proportion of older people and a smaller proportion of working age people than other Places in Croydon. It is also predicted that the proportion of older people will rise. Housing requirements will therefore be different in Shirley Place than elsewhere. There will be a need for different housing and different amenities.
Bungalows are particularly appropriate for the elderly and disabled. Not all elderly couples will require small footprint, 2 to 3 storey building, with three bedrooms. Sub-divided accommodation may often be more appropriate particularly if additional care is provided. There are few buildings within Shirley Place that are suitable for such conversion.

The council should reconsider the proportion of family housing appropriate for Monks Orchard to maintain sustainability. Bungalows should be retained or replaced with another bungalow. Bungalows should not be replaced with small footprint housing.

Change

There is justification for the policy and evidence of need for three bed homes comes from the Croydon Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015.
The percentages of 3 bed homes have been reviewed from Table 4.2, now relabelled Table 4.1 The range of Public Transport Accessibility Levels has been merged for the PTAL 0-3 with the percentage of 3 bed homes adjusted for 0-1PTAL to the figure of 2-3 PTAL, recognising that the original percentage in suburban locations of 80% 3 bed homes for 0-1 PTAL was high and less likely for the market to deliver. The adjustment of percentages of 3 bed homes from 80% in suburban locations to 70% and in urban locations from 70% to 60% in 0-3 PTAL areas only makes a 1% difference on the expected numbers of three bedroom homes likely to be delivered by this policy.

0105/01/011/DM2
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM2 (Option 1)

Option 1 does not enable sustainable development. The Council should reconsider the proportion of 2-3 storey, three bedroom, small footprint buildings within the Shirley Place as this type of building will not create sustainability as alternative developments will be required. The character of Monks Orchard will be destroyed together with the loss of roofscapes etc. Most new development increase housing density and provide smaller living space than existing residential properties which results in an increase in the residential density of the Local Place. This has the effect of a gradual change to the Housing and Residential densities of the Local Place, which places an unplanned load on the infrastructure and services for the Place. If there are no immediate adjacent properties a Residential Density should be commensurate to that of the character of nearest adjacent areas.

Reconsider the proportion of 2-3 storey, three bedroom, small footprint buildings within the Shirley Place.

No change

The Council has not proposed to fix a proportion of 2-3 storey three bedroom properties in Shirley. It is proposing a minimum proportion of three bedroom homes on developments of ten or more units. On all schemes regard must be had to the character of the area as set in the proposed preferred options for policies on Design and Local Character.

0105/01/013/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	If there are no immediate adjacent properties a Residential Density should be commensurate to that of the character of nearest adjacent areas.	If there are no immediate adjacent properties a Residential Density should be commensurate to that of the character of nearest adjacent areas.	No change	The London Plan contains a density matrix based on character and accessibility of an area. All development proposals are considered on this basis.No new housing will be built if existing site densities have to be maintained, or less, as it will not be viable with developers unable to make a profit. The Croydon Local Plan would therefore be undeliverable, unsound and the Council would then be reliant on the Croydon Local Plan: Stratgepic Policies, the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework to determine planning applications.
0105/01/015/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	Design of residential development should take into account the safety and security of residents.	Design of residential development should take into account the safety and security of residents.	Change	Proposed Policy on Design and Character will be combined with the policy on private and communal amenity space for new residential development and will refer to SPD3 ` Designing for Community Safety` which provides guidance on designing for safety and security of residents of residential development.
0105/01/012/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The London Plan (in Policy 3.5B) also requires that all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context, local character, density; tenure and land use mix; and relationships with, and provision of public, communal and open spaces, taking account of the needs of children and old people. Therefore any new proposed development should respect or enhance the Housing Density (in units/hectare) (i.e. the same or less units per hectare) as in the surrounding locality and should also respect or enhance the Residential Density i.e. the same or less (measured in Habitable Rooms per hectare) than those in the surrounding area. Most new development increase housing density and provide smaller living space than existing residential properties which results in an increase in the residential density of the Local Place. This has the effect of a gradual change to the Housing and Residential densities of the Local Place, which places an unplanned load on the infrastructure and services for the Place	Any new proposed developments should respect or enhance the Housing Density in the surrounding locality and should also respect or enhance the Residential Density in the surrounding area.	No change	No new housing will be built if existing site densities have to be maintained, or less, as it will not be viable with developers unable to make a profit. The Croydon Local Plan would therefore be undeliverable, unsound and the Council would then be reliant on the Croydon Local Plan: Stratgepic Policies, the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework to determine planning applications.

0111/01/001/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Workspace Group	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM2 (Option 1)	The policy is overly restrictive and greater consideration should be given to site specific circumstances.	No change	There is an established need for 3-bedroom properties in Croydon as evidenced by the Local Housing Market Assessment and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. An assessment was carried out to check whether the proposed policy will achieve the borough's strategic targets for larger homes, using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. The strategic target for three bedroom (or more) homes in the borough outside of the Croydon Opportunity Area has been revised to 50% in the Croydon Local Plan:Strategic Policies - Partial Review. A viability assessment for the Local Plan was carried out that did not identify an issue with this proposed policy.	
0115/01/030/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object		DM2 (Option 1)	Older housing stock will be redeveloped under this policy and this will compromise the village atmosphere of the ASPRA area of Addiscombe and will destroy the atmosphere of the Whitgift Estate.	Policy should prevent the redevelopment of older housing stock which will compromise the village atmosphere of Addiscombe.	No change	Each policy within the Croydon Local Plan is given the same weight, as the Croydon Local Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design and Character will be given the same and equal regard as proposed policy on Housing Choice which should address the concerns of this objection.
0115/01/028/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object		DM2 (Option 1)	The preferred option will not help to meet the strategic objectives because the policy offers little protection against demolition and re-development as blocks of flats. Older properties will become substandard by the poor quality sub-division of flats which has been happening in Addiscombe.	Policy should offer protection against the demolition of housing and re-development of blocks of flats.	No change	Unless the building is in Conservation Area or it is a statutory Listed Building the Council cannot prevent demolition of existing buildings as it does not require permission. However any redevelopment of the site would have to be considered against all the policies of the Croydon Local Plan including those on design, character and unit mix.
0115/01/029/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object		DM2 (Option 1)	The policy is deliverable due to the need for cheap housing close to East Croydon station but does not provide protection for residents who see a deterioration in their quality of life.	Policy should protect existing residents.	No change	The objection is ambiguous and the Council is unable to respond to it as a result.

0118/13/002/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The range of thresholds should be applied flexibility on a case by case basis and DM2 should be amended to make this clear.	Amend policy to allow the thresholds to be applied on a case by case basis.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.
0118/13/005/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	DM2: The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	Amend policy to allow for flexibility in the requirements to provide 3 bed units, on a site by site basis.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.
0118/13/001/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The requirements to provide 3 bed units on a prescriptive basis set out in Table 4.2 in not supported. Whilst there is some differentiation within the Croydon Opportunity Area and different PTAL ratings, the policy provides limited flexibility for market considerations to be addressed within the housing mix on new developments.	Amend policy to allow for flexibility in the requirements to provide 3 bed units.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.
0118/13/004/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	DM2: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	Amend policy to allow for flexibility in the requirements to provide 3 bed units, on a site by site basis.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.
0120/01/157/DM2 (Option 1)/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	You mention "sustainable communities"? How would you define them?	Define sustainable communities in a glossary to accompany the Croydon Local Plan.	No change	'Sustainable communities' is defined in the Glossary of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies.
0120/01/163/DM2 (Option 1)/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach is deliverable. It will be deliverable because of the need for cheap housing close to the East Croydon transport hub. Land owner and developers can be expected to fuel such development with the generous profit margins. Increase of density means decrease in quality of living		No change	The comment is noted.
0120/01/164/DM2 (Option 1)/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	The council is stating the obvious, but not providing protection for the residents who will see deterioration in their quality of life.		No change	The objection is ambiguous and the Council is unable to respond to it as a result.
0120/01/165/DM2 (Option 1)/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	Some residents will see this as an attractive investment plan.		No change	The comment is noted.

0120/01/161/DM2 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The policy offers little protection against demolition and re-development as blocks of flats. It should be appropriate to the area by mass/height/spacing.	Amend policy DM2 to protect against demolition and re-development as blocks of flats and ensure any redevelopment is appropriate to the area by mass/height/spacing.	No change	Unless the building is in Conservation Area or it is a statutory Listed Building the Council cannot prevent demolition of existing buildings as it does not require permission. However any redevelopment of the site would have to be considered against all the policies of the Croydon Local Plan including those on design, character and unit mix.
0120/01/160/DM2 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The inevitable conclusion is that older property will become substandard by the poor quality sub division into flats that has escalated in the last 20 years in 'Addiscombe'.	Amend the Policy DM2 to prevent older properties becoming substandard by the poor quality sub division into flats.	No change	Adopted Croydon Local Plan strategic policies SP2.6 and SP6.3 set high standards for new homes including minimum room sizes, minimum overall sizes and minimum environmental standards. The National Technical Housing Standards will be implemented in October 2015 and all new homes will need to adhere to the room sizes stipulated in these Standards. Development proposals that do not comply with these policies will be refused to ensure that sub-standard developments do not happen in Croydon. There is an established need for 3-bedroom properties in Croydon as evidenced by the Local Housing Market Assessment and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015.
0120/01/167/DM2 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development. It seems inevitable that older housing stock will be redeveloped under this policy. This will compromise the village atmosphere of the ASPRA area of 'Addiscombe'.	Amend Policy DM2 so that older housing stock is not encouraged to be redeveloped under this policy and the village atmosphere of the ASPRA area of 'Addiscombe' is not destroyed.	No change	Each policy within the Croydon Local Plan is given the same weight, as the Croydon Local Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design and Character will be given the same and equal regard as proposed Policy for Housing Choice which should address the concerns of this objection.

0120/01/159/DM2 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	Please add to Option 1 c. Requiring that in any identified community, for all development, consideration must be given for the provision of or enabling the provision of facilities essential to a sustainable community e.g schools, child care provision, health care centres, green spaces, recycling resources	Please add to Option 1 c. Requiring that in any identified community, for all development, consideration must be given for the provision of or enabling the provision of facilities essential to a sustainable community e.g schools, child care provision, health care centres, green spaces, recycling resources	No change	Developers now contribute towards the cost of providing most types of infrastructure via the Community Infrastructure Levy, a tax that has been charged on all new developments granted permission in Croydon since 1st April 2013. Since the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy it is no longer legally possible to have anything like the proposed clause c) in a planning policy.
0120/01/168/DM2 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development. It seems inevitable that older housing stock will be redeveloped under this policy. This will compromise the village atmosphere of the ASPRA area of 'Addiscombe'. It is likely to destroy the atmosphere of the Whitgift Estate. If the character and quality of the Whitgift Estate is to be preserved, it is essential that the restriction in the covenants to one detached house per plot is maintained through the planning process and, further, that subdivisions are not permitted. This does not prevent substantial extensions, in sympathy with the surroundings, such as have occurred and are occurring	Policy DM2 should be amended so that on the Whitgift Estate, where it is essential that the restriction in the covenants to one detached house per plot is maintained through the planning process and, further, that subdivisions are not permitted.	No change	Each policy within the Croydon Local Plan is given the same weight, as the Croydon Local Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design and Character will be given the same and equal regard as proposed Housing Choice Policy which should address the concerns of this objection. Covenants on properties are a legal matter that the planning process does not have regard to. It is quite possible for planning permission to be granted for a development that cannot take place because of a legal covenant.
0120/01/158/DM2 (Option 1)/C	ASPRA	Comment	DM2 (Option 1)	In simple words we need good quality housing, with amenities. This is not how majority perceives their neighbourhood. We are not feeling safe.		No change	The Croydon Local Plan seeks to ensure that all future housing is of a good quality with amenities through applying its policies to future developments.
0120/01/162/DM2 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	DM2 policy should be appropriate to the area by mass/height/spacing.		No change	Each policy within the Croydon Local Plan is given the same weight, as the Croydon Local Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design and Character will be given the same and equal regard as proposed policy on Housing Choice which should address the concerns of this objection.
0121/01/007/DM2 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Object	DM2 (Option 1)	We agree with the preferred option but like para 4 of Option 2. This will ensure that conversions within a street does not exceed 20%. This will safeguard local character and family homes.		No change	We welcome the support for option 1. The application of Option 2 was not considered practical on the grounds of difficulty in assessing percentages of conversions of long streets such as Brighton Road, and that this policy would be a 'first come first served' policy.

0130/01/004/DM2 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support	DM2 (Option 1)	Part (a) of draft Policy DM2 seeks to enable housing choice to deliver sustainable communities by requiring the minimum provision of homes designed with 3 or more bedrooms on sites of 10 or more dwellings as set out in Table 4.2 of the draft policy. Within central areas that have a PTAL rating of 6b it states that 20% of new residential developments should have a minimum of 3 bedrooms, with developments coming forward in the Retail Core (located within the COA) having a minimum of 5% 3 bedroom units. The purpose of this policy is to align Croydon's Local Plan with the adopted Croydon OAPF and on this basis we support this proposed policy and, in particular, Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option').		Welcome support	
0026/02/008/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Berkeley Homes PLC</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 2)	Any attempt to limit smaller units (studios) in the Opportunity Area, in line with the alternative option, would be resisted. The market will respond to demand for smaller units accordingly, over the lifetime of the Plan. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF also stresses the need to provide a competitive return to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable a development to be deliverable, it is imperative that there is flexibility within the policy to enable developers to respond to market requirements.	No limit to studios in Opportunity Area - leave to market demand.	No change	The proposal for limiting the number of studio homes in the Croydon Opportunity Area was put forward as an alternative approach.
0105/01/023/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 2)	Residential development should have regard to the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction (also see Chapter 4A).	Residential development should have regard to the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction	No change	The policy on Sustainable Design and Construction is aligned with the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction.
0105/01/020/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 2)	There should also be minimum room sizes and storage space: See London Plan:	Minimum room sizes and storage space.	No change	These are already a requirement of Policy SP2.6 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. The Technical Housing Standards-nationally described space standards will be implemented in October 2015 and all development will need to adhere to these standards which specify minimum room sizes and storage space.
0105/01/019/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM2 (Option 2)	If there are no immediate adjacent properties a Residential Density should be commensurate to that of the character of nearest adjacent areas.	If there are no immediate adjacent properties a Residential Density should be commensurate to that of the character of nearest adjacent areas.	No change	The London Plan contains a density matrix based on character and accessibility of an area. All development proposals are considered on this basis.

0105/01/018/DM2
(Option 2)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM2 (Option 2)

The London Plan (in Policy 3.5B) also requires that all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places, taking into account physical context, local character, density; tenure and land use mix; and relationships with, and provision of public, communal and open spaces, taking account of the needs of children and old people. Therefore any new proposed development should respect or enhance the Housing Density (in units/hectare) (i.e. the same or less units per hectare) as in the surrounding locality and should also respect or enhance the Residential Density i.e. the same or less (measured in Habitable Rooms per hectare) than those in the surrounding area. Most new development increase housing density and provide smaller living space than existing residential properties which results in an increase in the residential density of the Local Place. This has the effect of a gradual change to the Housing and Residential densities of the Local Place, which places an unplanned load on the infrastructure and services for the Place

Any new proposed developments should respect or enhance the Housing Density in the surrounding locality and should also respect or enhance the Residential Density in the surrounding area.

No change

No new housing will be built if existing site densities have to be maintained, or less, as it will not be viable with developers unable to make a profit. The Croydon Local Plan would therefore be undeliverable, unsound and the Council would then be reliant on the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework to determine planning applications.

0105/01/017/DM2
(Option 2)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM2 (Option 2)

Option 2 does not enable sustainable development. The Council should reconsider the proportion of 2-3 storey, three bedroom, small footprint buildings within the Shirley Place as this type of building will not create sustainability as alternative developments will be required. The character of Monks Orchard will be destroyed together with the loss of roofscapes etc. Most new development increase housing density and provide smaller living space than existing residential properties which results in an increase in the residential density of the Local Place. This has the effect of a gradual change to the Housing and Residential densities of the Local Place, which places an unplanned load on the infrastructure and services for the Place. If there are no immediate adjacent properties a Residential Density should be commensurate to that of the character of nearest adjacent areas.

The Council should reconsider the proportion of 2-3 storey, three bedroom, small footprint buildings within the Shirley Place

No change

The Council has not proposed to fix a proportion of 2-3 storey three bedroom properties in Shirley. It was proposing a minimum proportion of three bedroom homes on developments of ten or more units. On all schemes regard must be had to the character of the area as set in Design and Local Character policy.

0105/01/021/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM2 (Option 2)	Design of residential development should take into account the safety and security of residents.	Design of residential development should take into account the safety and security of residents.	No change	Proposed Policy on Design and Character will be combined with the policy on private and communal amenity space for new residential development and will refer to SPD3 'Designing for Community Safety' which provides guidance on designing for safety and security of residents of residential development.
0111/01/002/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Workspace Group</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM2 (Option 2)	The policy is overly restrictive and greater consideration should be given to site specific circumstances.		No change	Option 2 is not the preferred option. There is an established need for 3-bedroom properties in Croydon as evidenced by the Local Housing Market Assessment and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. An assessment was carried out to check whether the proposed policy will achieve the borough's strategic targets for larger homes, using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015. The stragic target for three bedroom or more, homes in the borough outside of the Croydon Opportunity Area has been revised to 50% in the Croydon Local Plan:Strategic Policies - Partial Review.
0118/13/003/DM2 (Option 2)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Option 2)	This option provides even greater inflexibility for site specific considerations to be interpreted within the planning decision making process.		Welcome support	Welcome support for option 2 not being the preferred option.
0121/01/008/DM2 (Option 2)/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object		DM2 (Option 2)	We agree with the preferred option 1 for DM2 but like para 4 of Option 2. This will ensure that conversions within a street does not exceed 20%. This will safeguard local character and family homes.	Selcet Option1 for DM1 but amend with para 4 of Option 2.	No change	We welcome the support for option 1. The application of Option 2 was not considered practical on the grounds of difficulty in assessing percentages of conversions of long streets such as Brighton Road, and that this policy would be a 'first come first served' policy.
0118/10/004/DM2 (Table 4.2)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Table 4.2)	Table 4.2: the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	The policy and supporting paragraphs should be amended to make the policy flexible and applicable on a case by case basis.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.

0118/10/002/DM2 (Table 4.2)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Table 4.2)	The range of thresholds should be applied flexibly on a case by case basis and the policy and paragraphs 4.60-4.63 should be amended to make this clear and provide the necessary flexibility in application.	The policy and supporting paragraphs should be amended to make the policy flexible and applicable on a case by case basis.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.
0118/10/001/DM2 (Table 4.2)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Table 4.2)	The requirements to provide 3 bed units on potentially prescriptive basis is not supported. Whilst there is some differentiation in relation to the Croydon Opportunity Area and different PTAL ratings, the policy provides limited flexibility for market considerations to be addressed within the housing mix on new developments. It is not for the Local Plan to define the suitability of housing mix for a site.	The plan should not define the suitability of housing mix for a site.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan needs to plan for the borough's housing needs which include the size of units required. If left to the market the housing need would not be met so the Plan needs to have some form of policy to direct housing mix.
0118/10/003/DM2 (Table 4.2)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM2 (Table 4.2)	Table 4.2: the preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	The policy and supporting paragraphs should be amended to make the policy flexible and applicable on a case by case basis.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan sets out the policy requirements that development proposals will be required to adhere to unless material considerations suggest otherwise. It is for applicants to put forward material considerations and each will be considered on their merit.
0003/05/008/DM3 (Option 1)/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support		DM3 (Option 1)	Welcomes the provision that development on garden land must not have any demonstratable negative impact on biodiversity.		Welcome support	The policy has retained the requirement for biodiversity to be protected.
0099/02/004/DM3 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM3 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	Support is welcomed. The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character'.
0100/01/001/DM3 (Option 1)/O	I Djemil	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM3 (Option 1)	The council should encourage the development of rear gardens in Purley and surrounding areas, where the back gardens are far too big for the needs of residents, as a way of increasing much needed housing stock. Rear garden development should be actively encouraged for the housing needs of disabled residents.		Change	The proposed policy does not preclude development of back gardens but is there to ensure that potential detrimental impacts of their development are considered and the most suitable design can be delivered. The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character'.

0101/01/001/DM3 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden Shirley Planning Forum	Object	Soundness - Effective DM3 (Option 1)	The preferred option will not enable sustainable development as it stands. The objectives and policies are unclear due to vague definitions.	Full unambiguous and specific guidance notes are required. Suggest the following words. 'DM3.1 The council will protect gardens by only permitting new dwellings within the curtilage of an existing dwelling where there will be no demonstrable negative impact on local character, amenity or biodiversity and, where a new dwelling will be visible from the SURROUNDING PROPERTIES it must respect the character of the area and the street scene. DM3.2 The character of the new development must be assessed against the immediate adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area. DM3.3 The need to deliver a specific target of new home should not outweigh the respect for local character, amenity garden space and biodiversity, loss of habitat, wild animal welfare or ecology.' Instead of 'The council will protect gardens by only permitting new dwellings within the curtilage of an existing dwelling where there will be no demonstrable negative impact on local character, amenity or biodiversity and, where a new dwelling will be visible from the STREET it must respect the character of the area and the street scene'.	Change	The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character' .Many of the comments are covered by the proposed preferred option for policy on garden land and the proposed preferred option Policy DM11 (Design and Character) including where DM11.1 says that "proposals should respect the development pattern, layout and siting; the scale, height, massing, density and mix. This considers surrounding properties. Each policy within the Plan is given the same weight ,as the Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design will be given the same and equal regard as policy targets for new homes and an application can be refused on grounds of design or impact on character and biodiversity even if it contributes to meeting the Council's housing targets (so long as the Council has a published five year supply of housing land which currently it does).
0105/01/025/DM3 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	Option 1 Does not enable sustainable development. The objective and the policy are unclear because definitions associated with this topic are unclear. There is a long history of failure to achieve the stated objectives. Residents doubt the stated sincerity of planners and politicians to maintain the character of the areas in which residents live. Residents believe that the council's major interest is to build as many houses as possible within the smallest acceptable area. The council need to work hard to convince residents of their sincerity and find a way to categorically define their intensions and to finally stop unwanted back garden, tandem and similar developments. Full, unambiguous specific guidance notes are required. Perhaps the council should actually do what they say and not play with words.	The objectives, policy and definitions associated with this topic should be made clearer with the inclusion of full, unambiguous specific guidance notes in relation to unwanted back garden, tandem and similar developments.	Change	The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the preferred option for policy on 'Design and character' . Design and character by its nature is subjective and the Council, in producing the Borough Character Appraisal, has tried already to make assessments of character clearer and reduce some of the subjectivity.
0105/01/027/DM3 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	The need to deliver a specific target of new homes should NOT outweigh the respect for local character, amenity garden space, and biodiversity, loss of animal habitat, wild animal welfare or ecology	No change	Supporting text to the Policy states that "the need to deliver 20,200 homes does not outweigh the need to respect the local character, and amenity and to protect biodiversity."	

0105/01/024/DM3
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM3 (Option 1)

Object to Policy DM3, Option1 unless it is modified as follows: Modified Option 1. The Council will protect gardens by only permitting new dwellings within the curtilage of an existing Dwelling where there will be no demonstrable negative impact on local character, amenity, or biodiversity and, where a new dwelling will be visible from the surrounding properties, it must respect the character of the area and the street scene.
We believe that the planning proposals should integrate, respect and enhance the borough's natural environment and built heritage. To encourage this, we propose that the following additions:
The character of the new development must be assessed against the immediate adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area.
Apply DM1.3, Option 3 for Permitted Developments which states that: where only the minimum standard of private amenity space is met, permitted development extensions may be removed to ensure retention of the minimum private amenity provision.
The need to deliver a specific target of new homes should NOT outweigh the respect for local character, amenity garden space, and biodiversity, loss of animal habitat, wild animal welfare or ecology.

Policy should be modified as follows; The Council will protect gardens by only permitting new dwellings within the curtilage of an existing dwelling where there will be no demonstrable negative impact on local character, amenity or biodiversity, and where a new dwelling will be visible from the surrounding properties, it must respect the character of the area and the street scene.

Following additions to the policy: The character of the new development must be assessed against the immediate adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area.

Apply DM1.3 Option 3 for Permitted Development: here only the minimum standard of private amenity space is met, permitted development extensions may be removed to ensure retention of the minimum private amenity provision.

Change

The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character'. Many of the comments are already covered by the preferred option of proposed Policy on garden land and Design and Character which states that "proposals should respect the development pattern, layout and siting; the scale, height, massing, and density. This considers surrounding properties.

Each policy within the Plan is given the same weight, as the Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design will be given the same and equal regard as policy targets for new homes and an application can be refused on grounds of design or impact on character and biodiversity even if it contributes to meeting the Council's housing targets (so long as the Council has a published five year supply of housing land which currently it does).

Policies cannot be applied to Permitted Development as in effect they have planning permission already and policies can only be applied to proposals that require planning consent.

0115/01/025/DM3
(Option 1)/O

Mr Bob Sleeman

Object

DM3 (Option 1)

The policy does not appear to address the planning regime when multiple large older properties are developed and higher density development using more of the garden space for dwellings is proposed.

Policy should address the issues when high density development is proposed.

No change

The preferred option for policy on Design and Character addresses this objection as DM11.1 says that "proposals should respect the development pattern, layout and siting; the scale, height, massing, and density. This considers the redevelopment of older and larger properties.
The policy text for the preferred option on development of garden land has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character'.

Each policy within the Plan is given the same weight, as the Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design will be given the same and equal regard as policies on development on garden land.

0115/01/027/DM3 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	The policy will be self-fulfilling in Addiscombe where large areas to the north are unsuitable for this type of development but will south of Addiscombe will not be afforded significant protection from in-fill.	Policy should address the South of Addiscombe.	No change	All areas are covered by this proposed preferred option for policy on garden land and it would be applied in conjunction with all other policies of the Plan including policies on Design and Character.
0115/01/026/DM3 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Sleeman	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	The policy is deliverable in the north of Addiscombe where there is little opportunity to build in back gardens but in the south of Addiscombe higher density housing will be possible by building on gardens. The wording of the policy does not stop infill and garden development where there is a planning gain by the provision of additional housing. It needs to be more specific by street to provide guidance to residents and developers and should define which areas are not protected by this policy.	Policy should address the South of Addiscombe and provide street by street detail to define which areas are not protected by this policy.	No change	All areas are covered by this policy and it would be applied in conjunction with all other policies of the Plan including policies on Design and Character.
0120/01/149/DM3 (Option 1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM3 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The development of dwellings on gardens has been ongoing in 'Addiscombe' and in general has produced property that does not detract from the neighbourhood.		Welcome support	
0120/01/156/DM3 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	It will be self-fulfilling in 'Addiscombe' where large areas to the north are unsuitable for this sort of development. The south of 'Addiscombe' will not be afforded significant protection from in-fill.	Consider amending Policy DM3.Option1 to ensure the south of 'Addiscombe' is afforded significant protection from in-fill.	No change	All areas are covered by this proposed policy and it would be applied in conjunction with all other policies of the Plan including policies on Design and Character.
0120/01/150/DM3 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	However as the housing stock in 'Addiscombe' deteriorates and drops below required energy efficiency standards there will be re-development. This policy does not appear to address the planning regime when multiple large older properties are demolished and higher density development using more of the garden space for dwellings is proposed.	Policy DM3 should address the possibility of multiple large older properties being demolished and higher density development using more of the garden space for proposed dwellings.	No change	Proposed Policy on development on garden land is not meant to cover situations where the existing property is demolished. In cases where the existing property is demolished and a new building is proposed Policy on Design and character would apply which states that developments must enhance and sensitively respond to the predominant built form and proposals should respect the development pattern, layout and siting, and the scale, height, massing, and density.

0120/01/152/DM3 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	In the south of 'Addiscombe' higher density housing will be possible by building on gardens. The wording of the policy does not add any teeth to stop infill and garden development where there is a planning gain by the provision on additional housing (and significant profit for the land owner and developer).	The wording of the policy DM3 should add teeth to stop infill and garden development where there is a planning gain by the provision on additional housing (and significant profit for the land owner and developer).	Change	All areas are covered by this proposed policy and it would be applied in conjunction with all other policies of the Croydon Local Plan including policies on Design and Character. The Council can't produce a policy that provides a blanket ban on development on garden land as overall the Plan is required by the National Planning Policy Framework to enable sustainable development. The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character'. It sets criteria with which to assess development proposals on garden land to ensure that the only proposals permitted are those which, if you went away for five years, then returned and the proposals had been built, wouldn't cause you to think "what on earth has the Council allowed here?"
0120/01/155/DM3 (Option 1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM3 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach enables sustainable development. It will be self-fulfilling in 'Addiscombe' where large areas to the north are unsuitable for this sort of development		Welcome support	
0120/01/154/DM3 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	It should define which areas will not be protected by this policy.	DM3 Option1 should define which areas will not be protected by this policy.	No change	All areas are covered by this proposed policy and it would be applied in conjunction with all other policies of the Plan including policies on Design and Character.
0120/01/151/DM3 (Option 1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM3 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach is deliverable. In the north of 'Addiscombe' where there is little opportunity to build in back gardens this will work well.		Welcome support	
0120/01/153/DM3 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM3 (Option 1)	It needs to be more specific by street to provide guidance to residents and developers.	DM3 Option1 needs to be more specific by street to provide guidance to residents and developers.	No change	All areas are covered by this proposed policy and it would be applied in conjunction with all other policies of the Plan including policies on Design and Character. It is not possible to provide an individual policy for each street in the borough as the Council does not have the resources to do this as there are too many streets to assess for little benefit as there are only a small number of applications for this type of development each year.

0121/01/009/DM3 (Option 1)/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support	DM3 (Option 1)	Agree with preferred option.		Welcome support	
0028/03/010/DM3 (Option 2)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	DM3 (Option 2)	Proposed policy does not seem to add anything to that contained within design policies. As such, it is unnecessary.	Remove policy.	Change	The overlap with other policies is noted, however, the development of garden land is a particular local issue for Croydon and given the number of applications for this type of development, a specific policy provides both clarity and aids the determination of planning applications. The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character'.
0105/01/026/DM3 (Option 2)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM3 (Option 2)	This is not preferred, DM3 Option 1 with modifications is preferred. As follows: Modified Option 1 - The Council will protect gardens by only permitting new dwellings within the curtilage of an existing Dwelling where there will be no demonstrable negative impact on local character, amenity, or biodiversity and, where a new dwelling will be visible from the surrounding properties, it must respect the character of the area and the street scene. We believe that the planning proposals should integrate, respect and enhance the borough's natural environment and built heritage. To encourage this, we propose that the following additions: The character of the new development must be assessed against the immediate adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area. Apply DM1.3, Option 3 for Permitted Developments which states that: where only the minimum standard of private amenity space is met, permitted development extensions may be removed to ensure retention of the minimum private amenity provision.	Policy should be modified as follows; The Council will protect gardens by only permitting new dwellings within the curtilage of an existing dwelling where there will be no demonstrable negative impact on local character, amenity or biodiversity, and where a new dwelling will be visible from the surrounding properties, it must respect the character of the area and the street scene. Following additions to the policy: The character of the new development must be assessed against the immediate adjacent properties, the street scene and the wider area. Apply DM1.3 Option 3 for Permitted Development: here only the minimum standard of private amenity space is met, permitted development extensions may be removed to ensure retention of the minimum private amenity provision.	Change	Welcome the support for not using Option 2. Many of the comments are already covered by the proposed Policy on garden land and proposed Policy DM11 (Design and Character) including where DM11.1 says that "proposals should respect the development pattern, layout and siting; the scale, height, massing, and density. This considers surrounding properties. The policy text has been amended, to be positively worded and aligns with the policy on 'Design and character' . Each policy within the Plan is given the same weight, as the Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on Design will be given the same and equal regard as policy targets for new homes and an application can be refused on grounds of design or impact on character and biodiversity even if it contributes to meeting the Council's housing targets (so long as the Council has a published five year supply of housing land which currently it does). Policies cannot be applied to Permitted Development as in effect they have planning permission already and policies can only be applied to proposals that require planning consent.

0101/01/004/DM4 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM4 (Option 1)	The policy is not sustainable as residential annexes are likely to be provided using Permitted Development regulations. These ignore normal planning regulations, are uncontrolled and do not require council supervision, leaving developments open to misuse.		Change	The preferred option has been amended to 'no policy option' and the alternative option is now a revised version of the original Option 1. The decision for a preferred option of no policy was made after consideration of the whole Local Plan policies and that the Design and character policies addressed the main objective of a policy on annexes, that is to address the issue of impact on the streetscene of annexes.
0101/01/002/DM4 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM4 (Option 1)	Additional clauses are required to make this policy achievable.	Propose the following additional wording: 'g) It is important to maintain a defined ratio of house and garden area with that of adjacent properties.	Change	The preferred option has been amended to 'no policy option' and the alternative option is now a revised version of the original Option 1. The decision for a preferred option of no policy was made after consideration of the whole Local Plan policies and that the Design and character policies addressed the main objective of a policy on annexes, that is to address the issue of impact on the streetscene of annexes. The proposed preferred option for policy on Design and character already protects the amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties and covers scale, height and massing of development. It is unnecessary to duplicate these requirements in the Homes policies. It would also be very expensive to define plot ratios for every street in the borough due to the large amount of work involved. Plot ratios also vary considerably even within one street as different houses have different features. Each site is considered on its own merits and its specific context (including neighbouring properties).

0101/01/003/DM4 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM4 (Option 1)	The phrase "capable of re-integration" requires definition and clarity	Define and clarify the phrase "capable of re-integration"	Change	The preferred option has been amended to 'no policy option' and the alternative option is now a revised version of the original Option 1. The decision for a preferred option of no policy was made after consideration of the whole Local Plan policies and that the Design and character policies addressed the main objective of a policy on annexes, that is to address the issue of impact on the streetscene of annexes. The phrase 'capable of re-integration' has been removed as it was not understood.
0105/01/030/DM4 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM4 (Option 1)	The policy is unsustainable because residential annexes may be provided using Permitted Developments regulations. These ignore normal planning regulations, are uncontrolled, do not require Council supervision and are open to misuse. Beds-in-sheds.	Residential annexes provided under permitted development rights should be addressed.	Change	The preferred option has been amended to 'no policy option' and the alternative option is now a revised version of the original Option 1. The decision for a preferred option of no policy was made after consideration of the whole Local Plan policies and that the Design and character policies addressed the main objective of a policy on annexes, that is to address the issue of impact on the streetscene of annexes.

0105/01/028/DM4
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM4 (Option 1)

Yes, DM4 Option 1 is supported and is deliverable WITH modification to the Policy DM4- Option 1 to state :- DM4.1 Residential annexes, where part of an existing unit will be allowed if they: (As per Option 1 with the following additional clauses and clarifications)

- Permitted Developments should not be allowed to reduce the amenity garden space to below a minimum defined proportion ref: Policy DM1.3, Option 3
- Permitted Developments require close supervision to ensure that they are not being misused. (Beds-In-Sheds)
- It is important to maintain a defined proportion of the ratio of the areas of the house footprint: garden area, with that of adjacent properties.
- The phrase 'capable of re-integration' requires a definition

There is a need for a higher proportion of properties suitable for older people who may need different amenities and support. Some will require granny annexes.

See comments for DM1& DM2- these refer to character, and DM1 comment stated Shirley Place has a different population mix than elsewhere in Croydon. The population of retired individuals is predicted to rise dramatically. DM2 comment stated bungalows are particularly appropriate for the elderly and disabled. Not all elderly couples will require small footprint 2 or 3 storey building with 3 bedrooms. Sub divided accomodation may offer be more appropriate particularly if additional care is provided. There are few buildings in Shirely suitable for such conversion.

Modify policy DM4 Option 1: Residential annexes, where part of an existing unit will be allowed if they (as per option one with the following additional clauses and clarifications:

Permitted developments should not be allowed to reduce the amenity garden space to below a minimum defined proportion ref: policy DM1.3 Option 3
Permitted developments require close supervision to ensure that they are not being misused
It is important to maintain a defined proportion of the ratio of the areas of the house footprint: garden area, with that of adjacent properties

The phrase capable of re-integration requires a definition.

Change

Policies cannot be applied to Permitted Development as in effect they have planning permission already and policies can only be applied to proposals that require planning consent.

Proposed Design and Character policy DM11 already protects the amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties and covers scale, height and massing of development. It is unnecessary to duplicate these requirements in a Policy on Residential Annexes. It would also be very expensive to define plot ratios for every street in the borough due to the large amount of work involved. Plot ratios also vary considerably even within one street as different houses have different features. Each site is considered on its own merits and its specific context (including neighbouring properties). The preferred option for residential annexes has been amended to 'no policy option' and the alternative option is now a revised version of the original Option 1. The decision for a preferred option of no policy was made after consideration of the whole Local Plan policies and that the Design and character policies addressed the main objective of a policy on annexes, that is to address the issue of impact on the streetscene of annexes. The phrase 'capable of re-integration' has been removed from the supporting text for the alternative option as it confused people.

0121/01/010/DM4
(Option 1)/S

Tarsem Flora

PWRA

Support

DM4 (Option 1)

Agree with preferred option.

Change

The preferred option has been amended to 'no policy option' and the alternative option is now a revised version of the original Option 1. The decision for a preferred option of no policy was made after consideration of the whole Local Plan policies and that the Design and character policies addressed the main objective of a policy on annexes, that is to address the issue of impact on the streetscene of annexes.

0026/02/003/DM5 (Option 1)/S	Berkeley Homes PLC	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM5 (Option 1)	The provision to agree commuted sums for affordable housing in the Opportunity Area is welcomed and will help to meet the Strategic Objectives 3, 4 & 7.		Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0028/03/008/DM5 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen White & Sons	Object		DM5 (Option 1)	Provision of certainty by way of a set figure for commuted payments in lieu of affordable housing is welcomed. However, there will be circumstances where payments will affect the viability of development and there needs to be a mechanism for negotiating reduced payments referred to in the policy.	Policy needs a mechanisms for negotiating reduced payments.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0028/03/009/DM5 (Option 1)/C	Mr Andrew Steen White & Sons	Comment		DM5 (Option 1)	In any commuted payments the Council should take account of the fact that the payment will be taken off the value of land rather than paid out of profits by the developer. As such, the impact of this policy will be felt by the original landowner rather than developer.	Take account of the fact that the impact of this policy will be felt on the landowner as the payment will be taken off the value of the land.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0093/01/002/DM5 (Option 1)/C	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Comment		DM5 (Option 1)	Table 4.3 should not use the figure of £27,800 per affordable unit as this figure is derived from the "Affordable Housing Viability Assessment - Additional Analysis(2011)." As this document will not be adopted until 2014, and considering the rise in residential prices since the document was produced it is inadvisable to use this figure.	Table 4.3 should not use the figure of £27,800 per affordable unit	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/03/002/DM5 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object		DM5 (Option 1)	Policy DM5, table 4.3 and Appendix 1 should be amended to ensure that site specific viability considerations are taken into account in the determination of any commuted sum payment.	Amend DM5, table 4.3 and Appendix 1 to ensure that site specific viability considerations are taken into account.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/03/003/DM5 (Option 1)/S	Redrow Homes	Support		DM5 (Option 1)	The reference to the CIL and Social Housing Relief is noted.		Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/03/001/DM5 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object		DM5 (Option 1)	The requirements for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum payment for affordable housing is prescriptive as set out in policy DM5 and table 4.3 is not supported.	Amend the requirements for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum payment for affordable housing.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/03/005/DM5 (Option 1)/O	Redrow Homes	Object		DM5 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	Amend the requirements for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum payment for affordable housing and ensure that site specific viability considerations are taken into account.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0121/01/011/DM5 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Object		DM5 (Option 1)	Not happy with any of these policies in relation to affordable homes. They are complex and will not encourage developments.	Amend policy DM5 Option1, simplify and reword to encourage developments.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.

0130/01/005/DM5 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support	DM5 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM5 sets out the Council's suggested approach to commuted sums for the provision of affordable homes. Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') sets out that in the COA where a commuted sum or review mechanism is agreed in lieu of on-site provision of affordable housing, negotiating the value of each affordable unit will be carried out as per Table 4.3. We consider Option 1 is preferable to Option 2 as it should ensure a more certain mechanism for calculation of payment in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision.		Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/03/004/DM5 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM5 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	Amend the requirements for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum payment for affordable housing and ensure that site specific viability considerations are taken into account.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/11/005/DM5 (Table 4.3)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM5 (Table 4.3)	Table 4.3: The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	Amend policy to remove the prescriptive requirement for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum of affordable housing to allow for a site by site basis.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/11/001/DM5 (Table 4.3)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM5 (Table 4.3)	The requirement for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum of affordable housing is prescriptive and is not supported.	Amend policy to remove the prescriptive requirement for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum of affordable housing.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/11/004/DM5 (Table 4.3)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM5 (Table 4.3)	Table 4.3: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	Amend policy to remove the prescriptive requirement for all sites with nine or fewer units to provide a commuted sum of affordable housing to allow for a site by site basis.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.
0118/11/002/DM5 (Table 4.3)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM5 (Table 4.3)	Paragraphs 4.98-4.107 and table 4.3 should be amended to ensure that site specific viability considerations are taken into account in the determination of any commuted sum payment.	Amend paragraphs and table to ensure that site specific viability considerations are taken into account.	Change	This policy has been deleted and will not be included in the Plan.

5 Employment

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0133/01/003//O	Margaret Clinch		Object			Over the years have seen the town centre steadily deteriorate, particularly since the arrival of the huge Tesco store, which proved the death-knell of the smaller shops that used to be a feature of shopping in Purley. I am also tired of seeing the empty, boarded-up, space where we used to have our original Sainsbury store.	Purley needs more small shops, and the original Sainsbury's store reused.	No change	Comment noted
0130/01/010/5.006/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>		Support		5.006	At Paragraph 5.6 of the consultation document the Council sets out a number of proposed amendments to the Policies Map. Appendix 2 of the consultation document provides these proposed revisions in greater detail and, in particular, seeks to extend the defined PSA in the CMC to include the entire Retail Core as defined in the OAPF. The Council's stated reason for suggesting this approach is to support and reflect the changing nature of Wellesley Road and, importantly, the comprehensive planned, retail-led regeneration of this area. We support the proposed expansion of the defined PSA as set out in the consultation document which would bring the existing, outdated, PSA boundary in line with the OAPF's Retail Core boundary. This proposed change will enable the Council's Proposals Map to be brought in line with the Croydon OAPF in terms of the Council's policy aspirations for comprehensive development in a significant part of the Retail Core.		Welcome support	
0099/02/010/DM10 (Option 1)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>		Object	Soundness - Effective	DM10 (Option 1)	For both options the CCG would like to see a statement that developers will be asked to adhere to stringent health and safety considerations, particularly with respect to accident prevention.		No change	This suggestion is beyond the scope of this document as it is covered by other legislation.
0105/01/033/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>		Object		DM10 (Option 1)	We do not understand the relevance of Table 4.3 (DM5) to this policy.	Clarity required on the relevance of Table 4.3	No change	The reference is to Table 4.3 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies not to Table 4.3 in this document.
0105/01/032/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>		Object		DM10 (Option 1)	We have searched the policy document and have not found a definition of "HIGH DENSITY or LOW DENSITY. Unless these statements are defined, the policy is flawed as it could not be implemented in practice. The Policy requires clarification.	Defintion of high density or low density is required.	No change	It is not considered necessary to specify definitions as suggested. Each site will be different and will be informed by the surrounding development. Intensification could take place without the need for a definition.

0105/01/034/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM10 (Option 1)	Any expansion of Industrial and warehousing premises should ensure a minimum separation between adjacent residential boundaries and properties to the industrial sites. This distance should be specified. (say 25m for two storeys with additional 5m for each additional storey	The minimum distance between industrial and warehousing premises and residential boundaries should be specified.	No change	It is not considered practical to specify a minimum distance between uses as each site will be different. Furthermore, the policy only applies to the Strategic, Separated and Integrated Industrial Locations where, by definition, greater separation between industrial and residential uses exists.
0128/01/019/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object		DM10 (Option 1)	DM10 will severely constrain development and is contrary to the NPPF by placing unnecessary restriction on changes to industrial locations. It is therefore considered not to be able to achieve the strategic objectives of 2 and 4.	Remove restrictions on industrial locations to ensure policy is in accordance with the NPPF.	No change	It is considered that this policy does the opposite of 'placing restrictions' on industrial development. The supporting text explains how this would work.
0128/01/020/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object		DM10 (Option 1)	Do not consider the policy to be able to assist in delivering sustainable development.	Ensure policy enables sustainable development.	No change	This policy promotes more efficient use of Tier 1 Industrial land and this is considered to be a sustainable approach.
0128/01/022/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object		DM10 (Option 1)	The thrust of the policy is to ensure that intensification does not occur in areas that are more sensitive and which may have negative consequences for amenity. Consider that existing policies are adequate to treat each case on its merits and that controls on intensification could be imposed through conditions. Intensification of all industrial areas should be encouraged, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.	Policy should encourage the intensification of all industrial areas, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.	Change	Option 2 is preferred as it widens the scope of locations where industrial intensification will be promoted. In response to the tightening of supply of such premises it is considered that this option is more appropriate than Option 1.
0128/01/021/DM10 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object		DM10 (Option 1)	Do not consider that this policy is necessary, having regard to the adopted policy within the strategic policies, which provides a breakdown of the characteristics of each industrial location site.	Remove policy.	No change	Croydon is facing a shortage of industrial premises and this policy could enable increases in floorspace/activity to take place.
0054/05/005/DM10 (Option 2)/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object		DM10 (Option 2)	Will have a negative impact on reducing flood risk.	Policy should not have a negative impact on flood risk.	No change	The intensification of the borough's low density industrial and warehousing premises would be subject to the development management process affording the opportunity to deliver this aim in a way that alleviates the flood risk. The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0099/02/011/DM10 (Option 2)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM10 (Option 2)	For both options the CCG would like to see a statement that developers will be asked to adhere to stringent health and safety considerations, particularly with respect to accident prevention.		No change	This suggestion is beyond the scope of this document and is covered by other legislation.

0121/01/014/DM10 (Option 2)/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support		DM10 (Option 2)	Prefer this Option 2.	Select Option 2 for Policy DM10 as the preferred approach.	Change	Support for Option 2 is noted and this is now the Preferred Option
0026/02/004/DM6 (Option 1)/O	<i>Berkeley Homes PLC</i>	Object	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM6 (Option 1)	Poicy DM6.4 is the most appropriate approach for Croydon to meet its Strategic Objectives but will not be deliverable as the demand for commercial space at the ground floor of a development is usually very uncertain at the time of any planning application. Although the approach of allowing conversion after 2 years is welcome a more flexible approach where there are no identified end users for ground floors and a surplus of commercial space in the vicinity of a development would accelerate delivery of new housing and eliminate further vacant floor space and eliminate dead frontages as well as future disturbance for any occupiers on upper floors from later conversion work. Policy should be positive towards granting consents which allow for a variety of users on ground floors to help attract tenants.	Amend Policy DM6.4 to be more flexible where there are no identified end users for ground floors and a surplus of commercial space in the vicinity of a development and to be positive towards granting consents which allow for a variety of users on ground floors to help attract tenants.	No change	The purpose of this policy is to discourage mixed-uses development involving speculative commercial space at ground floor level. Unless a specific end user is identified at the planning application stage for the ground floor space, the Council would rather see the proposal come forward as a single use. This to encourage the design of an 'active frontage' rather than create vacant ground floor shell which may take years to let.
0086/01/003/DM6 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andy Quinn	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM6 (Option 1)	There is perhaps a need fo restricting certain uses as there are now 14 estate and letting agents on the Crystal Palace Triangle that don't bring many people to the town centre.		No change	The number of A2 uses will be restricted in frontages designated as Main Retail Frontages and Secondary Retail Frontages.
0099/02/006/DM6 (Option 1)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM6 (Option 1)	The number of A5 outlets near schools should be limited and should not be allowed on routes most used by children. This will support Strategic Objective (SO) 6.		No change	Policies Development in Shopping Parades and Development in edge of centre and out of centre locations seek to address this point by limiting the clustering of A5 uses and preventing new takeaways outside of town centres.
0130/01/006/DM6 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support		DM6 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM6 sets out the Council's proposed approach to ensuring vitality and viability of the CMC (as designated by the London Plan), District Centres and Local Centres, by introducing a number of policies to replace UDP Policies SH3, SH4 and SH5. We agree with all aspects of Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') and, in particular, draft Policy DM6.1, draft Policy DM6.2 and the Council's proposed amendments to the 'Policies Map' to extend the Primary Shopping Area ('PSA') in the CMC to include the entire Retail Core as defined in the OAPF.		Welcome support	

0130/01/009/DM6 (Option 1)/O	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Object		DM6 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM6.4 of Option 1 seeks to control developments outside of Main and Secondary Frontages, but within centres. After a review of draft Policy DM6 in its entirety, we are not clear on the role or function of DM6.4 in the context of DM6 as a whole and the NPPF.	DM6.4 of Option 1-clarify the role or function of DM6.4 in the context of DM6 as a whole and the NPPF.	No change	The purpose of this policy is to avoid the situation where speculative ground floor space (usually to a core and shell finish) is provided as part of a larger development but then remains empty for many years even though the upper floors are fully occupied.
0130/01/007/DM6 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support		DM6 (Option 1)	Option 1 of the draft Policy DM6.1 seeks to ensure that the vitality and viability of the CMC is maintained and increased by not permitting new development or changes of use which would result in a net loss of ground floor Class A uses within defined Main Retail Frontages. We support this proposal and consider it necessary to ensure that the CMC's vitality and viability is enhanced as the Council wishes to ensure that the Retail Core can meet its policy aspirations as set out in the London Plan's Strategic Policy Direction for the CMC and in the Croydon OAPF.		Welcome support	
0099/02/005/DM6 (Table 5.1)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM6 (Table 5.1)	The CCG supports option 1 with the caveat that the maximum space for community use be increased as per option 2. This will support Strategic Objective (SO) 6 and be an enabler for the provision of primary care services.	Increase the maximum size of a community facility as per Option 2	No change	The purpose of the policy is to enable smaller community uses to locate in retail frontages (such as dentists, opticians etc) but to direct larger community uses (e.g. clinics, place of worship etc) to other parts of the town centre.
0130/01/008/DM6 (Table 5.1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support		DM6 (Table 5.1)	Draft Policy DM6.2 (together with Table 5.1) controls the 'expansion of existing uses or newly proposed uses'. We agree with the Council's 'Preferred Option' in this respect.		Welcome support	
0086/01/002/DM6 (Table 5.3)/C	Mr Andy Quinn	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM6 (Table 5.3)	One of the reasons for re-designating parts of Westow Hill according to the consultation is to attract investment for long standing empty units. This information is now out of date as there are now only two empty units along the whole of Westow Hill, one of which is being used by the owner as storage space even though it has planning permission to extend. On Church Road the units are also under offer and reopening with really only two empty units (both owned by the same developer).		Change	In light of the evidence provided, the proposed replacement of Main Retail Frontage with Secondary Retail Frontage at 2-24 Westow Hill will not be taken forward. These units will remain designated as Main Retail Frontage.
0099/02/007/DM7 (Option 1)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM7 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 but would like to see a comment that the number of A5 outlets near schools will be limited and will not be allowed on routes most used by children. This will support SO6 and be an enabler for the provision of primary care services.		No change	It is considered that the policies restricting the clustering of A5 Uses will be sufficient in curbing excessive representation of take aways in Shopping Parades.

0101/01/005/DM7 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM7 (Option 1)	Policy should state that where local shops do not fall within the Local Centre or Shopping Parade designations that wider commercial use than A1 may be considered but that the fragmented conversion to residential use is not permitted in respect of units within one building or adjoining units within a parade.	Policy should state that where local shops do not fall within the Local Centre or Shopping Parade designations that wider commercial use than A1 may be considered but that the fragmented conversion to residential use is not permitted in respect of units within one building or adjoining units within a parade.	No change	It is envisaged that the number of occasions where the scenario outlined in the comment will happen are too few to justify a specific policy.
0121/01/013/DM7 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object		DM7 (Option 1)	We need to encourage a divers range of shops to meet the needs of the local community. Intensification of a particular use should be discouraged.	Amend DM7 Option1 .	No change	This policy promotes intensification of A1 use shops as they represent a diverse range of convenience retailers/services (e.g. grocers, hairdresser, newsagents, chemist, etc).
0121/01/012/DM7 (Option 1)/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support		DM7 (Option 1)	Agree with the preferred option.		Welcome support	None
0129/01/005/DM7 (Option 1)/O	 <i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object		DM7 (Option 1)	The policy approach meets the narrow and immediate strategic objectives set out in the document but is not sustainable. The plans neglect the need to improve the shopping parade along Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Moreland Road and the main Railway line to encourage more pedestrians and motorists to use. Effort should be placed by the Council to make it more attractive to small businesses by removed street furniture clutter, review how the roundabout at the Leslie Arms junction can be improved for pedestrians and motorists and improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	Improvements should be made to the Cherry Orchard Shopping Parade and Lower Addiscombe Road by improving pedestrian links, improving the road junction and removing street furniture clutter, as well as improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	No change	The suggested improvements are not relevant to this policy. The purpose of Policy DM7 is to set out acceptable uses within Shopping Parades.
0129/01/003/DM7 (Option 1)/O	 <i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object		DM7 (Option 1)	The policy is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. The plans neglect the need to improve the shopping parade along Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Moreland Road and the main Railway line to encourage more pedestrians and motorists to use. Effort should be placed by the Council to make it more attractive to small businesses by removed street furniture clutter, review how the roundabout at the Leslie Arms junction can be improved for pedestrians and motorists and improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	Improvements should be made to the Cherry Orchard Shopping Parade and Lower Addiscombe Road by improving pedestrian links, improving the road junction and removing street furniture clutter, as well as improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	No change	The suggested improvements are not relevant to this policy. The purpose of Policy DM7 is to set out acceptable uses within Shopping Parades.

0129/01/001/DM7 (Option 1)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM7 (Option 1)	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. The plans neglect the need to improve the shopping parade along Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Moreland Road and the main Railway line to encourage more pedestrians and motorists to use. Effort should be placed by the Council to make it more attractive to small businesses by removed street furniture clutter, review how the roundabout at the Leslie Arms junction can be improved for pedestrians and motorists and improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	Improvements should be made to the Cherry Orchard Shopping Parade and Lower Addiscombe Road by improving pedestrian links, improving the road junction and removing street furniture clutter, as well as improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	No change	The suggested improvements are not relevant to this policy. The purpose of Policy DM7 is to set out acceptable uses within Shopping Parades.
0129/01/002/DM7 (Option 2)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM7 (Option 2)	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives but raises concerns outside of the narrow scope it sets. The plans neglect the need to improve the shopping parade along Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Moreland Road and the main Railway line to encourage more pedestrians and motorists to use. Effort should be placed by the Council to make it more attractive to small businesses by removed street furniture clutter, review how the roundabout at the Leslie Arms junction can be improved for pedestrians and motorists and improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	Improvements should be made to the Cherry Orchard Shopping Parade and Lower Addiscombe Road by improving pedestrian links, improving the road junction and removing street furniture clutter, as well as improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	No change	The suggested improvements are not relevant to this policy. The purpose of Policy DM7 is to set out acceptable uses within Shopping Parades.
0129/01/004/DM7 (Option 2)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM7 (Option 2)	The policy is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. The plans neglect the need to improve the shopping parade along Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Moreland Road and the main Railway line to encourage more pedestrians and motorists to use. Effort should be placed by the Council to make it more attractive to small businesses by removed street furniture clutter, review how the roundabout at the Leslie Arms junction can be improved for pedestrians and motorists and improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	Improvements should be made to the Cherry Orchard Shopping Parade and Lower Addiscombe Road by improving pedestrian links, improving the road junction and removing street furniture clutter, as well as improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	No change	The suggested improvements are not relevant to this policy. The purpose of Policy DM7 is to set out acceptable uses within Shopping Parades.

0129/01/006/DM7 (Option 2)/O	Addiscombe Liberal Democrats	Object		DM7 (Option 2)	The policy approach meets the narrow and immediate strategic objectives set out in the document but is not sustainable. The plans neglect the need to improve the shopping parade along Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Moreland Road and the main Railway line to encourage more pedestrians and motorists to use. Effort should be placed by the Council to make it more attractive to small businesses by removed street furniture clutter, review how the roundabout at the Leslie Arms junction can be improved for pedestrians and motorists and improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	Improvements should be made to the Cherry Orchard Shopping Parade and Lower Addiscombe Road by improving pedestrian links, improving the road junction and removing street furniture clutter, as well as improving short term parking along Cherry Orchard.	No change	The suggested improvements are not relevant to this policy. The purpose of Policy DM7 is to set out acceptable uses within Shopping Parades.
0092/01/002/DM7 (Table 5.5)/C	Riddlesdown Residents Associatio	Comment	Soundness - Justified	DM7 (Table 5.5)	We would request that the designation of shopping parades as confirmed in the UDP 2006 Plan (Appendix 1, Sch 2 and Policy SH6) are retained for the shops in Mitchley Ave and Lower Barn Rd, which are a lifeline for many elderly within our area because no reference is made to these two sites, in these proposals.	Retain the existing designation of shopping parades for Mitchley Avenue and Lower Barn Road.	No change	Table 5.5 only shows amendments to the Shopping Parades. Its purpose is not to represent a full list as this is set out elsewhere.
0101/01/028/DM7 (Table 5.5)/O	Lesley Godden Shirley Planning Forum	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM7 (Table 5.5)	Orchard Way Shopping Parade should be retained and protected as a suburban shopping parade as it is situated in a low public transport accessibility location and serves a great number of residents.	Retain and protect Orchard Way shopping parade.	Change	Monks Orchard/Orchard Way will remain designated as a Shopping Parade
0105/01/031/DM7 (Table 5.5)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object		DM7 (Table 5.5)	We do not understand why Monks Orchard/Orchard Way shopping parade has been de-classified as this shopping parade serves a fairly large residential area in a low PTAL area. Therefore it is necessary to ensure that this parade retains the appropriate Classes of shops to serve the community and that none can be re-classified or converted to residential.	Monks Orchard/Orchard way should be classified as a shopping parade as this parade should retain the appropriate classes of shops to serve the community and that none can be re-classified or converted to residential.	Change	Monks Orchard/Orchard Way will remain designated as a Shopping Parade.
0120/01/110/DM7 (Table 5.5)/O	ASPRA	Object		DM7 (Table 5.5)	The variety of traders on Lower Addiscombe Road between Gloucester Road and Morland Road perhaps offer a wider variety, however the UDP section that defines that shopping parade has not been included in the current plan. Within Addiscombe the major parade should be listed and protected.	Add Lower Addiscombe Road between Gloucester Road and Morland Road shops to Table 5.5 as a Shopping Parade Designation.	No change	Table 5.5 lists the Shopping Parades where changes are proposed. The Lower Addiscombe Rd Parade does not feature in the table as it remains the same. As set out in Appendix 2, the frontages in Addiscombe District Centre continue to be designated (and therefore protected).

0120/01/111/DM7 (Table 5.5)/O	ASPRA	Object		DM7 (Table 5.5)	The variety of traders on Lower Addiscombe Road in Cherry Orchard Road perhaps offer a wider variety, however the UDP section that defines that shopping parade has not been included in the current plan. Within Addiscombe the major parade should be listed and protected.	Add Lower Addiscombe Road in Cherry Orchard Road shops to Table 5.5 as a Shopping Parade Designation.	No change	Table 5.5 lists the Shopping Parades where changes are proposed. The Lower Addiscombe Rd Parade does not feature in the table as it remains the same. As set out in Appendix 2, the frontages in Addiscombe District Centre continue to be designated (and therefore protected).
0120/01/112/DM7 (Table 5.5)/O	ASPRA	Object		DM7 (Table 5.5)	Additional small parade exists in Shirley Road - by the roundabout at the junction with Addiscombe Road junction and this is not listed in the UDP or in the new plans but it merits similar protection.	Add shops on Shirley Road - by the roundabout at the junction with Addiscombe Road junction to Table 5.5 as a Shopping Parade Designation.	No change	The Shopping Parade referred to is identified in the UDP and is not proposed to be altered/removed.
0120/01/113/DM7 (Table 5.5)/O	ASPRA	Object		DM7 (Table 5.5)	Additional small parade exists north along Shirley Road towards Ashburton School for example and this is not listed in the UDP or in the new plans but it merits similar protection.	Add small paradenorth along Shirley Road towards Ashburton School to Table 5.5 as a Shopping Parade Designation.	Change	54-74 Shirley Road is to be designated as a Shopping Parade
0101/01/027/DM7 (Table 5.5)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM7 (Table 5.5)	Accept the exclusion of 11 Bywood Avenue from the designated Shopping Parade		Welcome support	None
0099/02/008/DM8 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM8 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1. The CCG assumes that the text in option 1 refers to table 5.6 rather than 5.4 (specifically regarding A5 use). The Council's licensing powers to foster more responsible provision of pubs and bars is supported and the Council is encouraged to make full use of new legislation which allows it to take harm reduction into account in a more explicit way than has been the case to date.		Welcome support	Support welcomed and typo noted.

0089/01/002/DM9 (Option 1)/O	The Garden Centre Group	Object	DM9 (Option 1)	<p>Recognised that this policy is intended to reflect the government's continued commitment to the Town Centre First principle but seeks to provide an element of flexibility for proposals in edge of centre or out of centre locations. However, such a "one size fits all" approach is not appropriate for some specialist retail uses such as garden centres. Garden centres have very specific characteristics which render an out of centre location essential because the goods that they have sell have a very high bulk to low value ratio which render a town centre site unviable and impractical. In addition, the space requirements resulting from the nature of the goods sold, means that a 5 or 10% increase in floor area is unlikely to be sufficient to make a meaningful contribution to improving the efficiency or viability of the business. The policy would overly restrict the sustainable development of their existing businesses by preventing them from extending their existing operations to maintain their responsiveness and competitiveness in a changing market. Given the specific requirements of garden centres and the goods they sell they are not in direct competition with the high street and accordingly the relaxation of the proposed criteria as it relates to such specialist uses would not undermine the Council's intended support for the town centre.</p>	<p>Amend the policy to accommodate the specific needs of certain specialist retailers such as garden centres. It is suggested that the policy amended such that the same criteria as used for "other development" should be applied to the extension of garden centres and other such "specialist retailers with the following:</p> <p>Use: Garden Centres and other main town centres uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. Extension of existing building/use: Where a sequential test (and an impact assessment for schemes involving more than 2,500sqm of floor space) satisfactorily demonstrates such uses cannot be accommodated within the town centre or within an edge of centre locations, proposals will be acceptable in principle, provided the site is accessible and well connected to the town centre. Other development: where a sequential test (and an impact assessment for schemes involving more than 2,500sqm of floor space) satisfactorily demonstrates such uses cannot be accommodated within the town centre or within an edge of centre locations, proposals will be acceptable in principle, provided the site is accessible and well connected to the town centre.</p>	No change	The development management process allows applicants to make the case as to why their specific use should be given special consideration. It is not necessary to set out all possible exceptions to policies within the Local Plan.	
0093/01/010/DM9 (Option 1)/S	Mr Martin Jones Greater London Authority	Support	DM9 (Option 1)	Supports the preferred option for this policy which reflects the government's town centre first principle and locates new development in areas with the highest levels of public transport accessibility.		Welcome support	Support noted	
0099/02/009/DM9 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Support	Soundness - Justified	DM9 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 with the proviso that community facilities could be established in these locations, providing greater access to services and supporting SO1, SO4, SO6, SO7, SO8 & SO9.		Welcome support	Support welcomed and comments noted.
0128/01/005/DM9 (Option 1)/O	Ikea Properties Investments Ltd	Object	DM9 (Option 1)	Paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that planning policies should ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable and retained for the benefit of the community, which conflicts with the policy's approach to Use Class A5 uses.	Remove restrictions on Use Class A5 uses.	No change	Along with other policies in this chapter, the saturation of A5 uses is limited as the associated waste and delivery issues can cause harm to residential amenity.	

0128/01/001/DM9 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM9 (Option 1)	As worded, this policy is contrary to NPPF by placing an unnecessary restriction on extensions to out of centre facilities and is therefore inappropriate to fulfilling the strategic objectives 2 and 4.	Remove restrictions on out of centre developments to ensure policy is in accordance with NPPF.	No change	It is considered that this policy is a reasonable interpretation of the NPPF.
0128/01/003/DM9 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM9 (Option 1)	This policy is inconsistent with the NPPF as it would place a moratorium on the extension of take-aways and fast food facilities and would severely constrain the potential of existing out of centre town centre uses to expand. This restriction is not positively prepared.	Remove restrictions on out of centre developments to ensure policy is in accordance with NPPF.	No change	It is considered that this policy is a reasonable interpretation of the NPPF.
0128/01/002/DM9 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM9 (Option 1)	Do not consider this policy to be able to assist in delivering sustainable development which has three components in the NPPF, including economic. The sterilisation of existing out of centre provision has no backing within national policy guidance and is therefore not justified.	Remove restrictions on out of centre developments to ensure policy is in accordance with NPPF.	No change	It is considered that this policy is a reasonable interpretation of the NPPF. Nor is it considered that this policy would result in the 'sterilisation' of existing out of centre developments.
0128/01/004/DM9 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM9 (Option 1)	The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set policies for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. The policy would not allow for the consideration of some types of out of centre development, notably extensions. Extensions are an efficient way of facilitating consumer choice and diversity with minimal impacts on town centres. This policy is not sufficiently flexible to allow existing out of centre which has to respond to changes in the market and consumer behaviour, the policy is therefore not considered to be effective.	Remove restrictions on out of centre facilities to ensure policy is in accordance with NPPF and to create flexibility to allow for out of centre developments to respond to changes in the market and consumer behaviour.	No change	This policy is consistent with the NPPF as it permits modest extension of out of centre developments.

0089/01/003/DM9
(Option 2)/O

The Garden Centre Group

Object

DM9 (Option 2)

Recognised that this policy is intended to reflect the government's continued commitment to the Town Centre First principle but seeks to provide an element of flexibility for proposals in edge of centre or out of centre locations. However, such a "one size fits all" approach is not appropriate for some specialist retail uses such as garden centres. Garden centres have very specific characteristics which render an out of centre location essential because the goods that they have sell have a very high bulk to low value ratio which render a town centre site unviable and impractical. In addition, the space requirements resulting from the nature of the goods sold, means that a 5 or 10% increase in floor area is unlikely to be sufficient to make a meaningful contribution to improving the efficiency or viability of the business. The policy would overly restrict the sustainable development of their existing businesses by preventing them from extending their existing operations to maintain their responsiveness and competitiveness in a changing market. Given the specific requirements of garden centres and the goods they sell they are not in direct competition with the high street and accordingly the relaxation of the proposed criteria as it relates to such specialist uses would not undermine the Council's intended support for the town centre.

Amend the policy to accommodate the specific needs of certain specialist retailers such as garden centres. It is suggested that the policy amended such that the same criteria as used for "other development" should be applied to the extension of garden centres and other such "specialist retailers with the following:

Use: Garden Centres and other main town centres uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres.
Extension of existing building/use: Where a sequential test (and an impact assessment for schemes involving more than 2,500sqm of floor space) satisfactorily demonstrates such uses cannot be accommodated within the town centre or within an edge of centre locations, proposals will be acceptable in principle, provided the site is accessible and well connected to the town centre.
Other development: where a sequential test (and an impact assessment for schemes involving more than 2,500sqm of floor space) satisfactorily demonstrates such uses cannot be accommodated within the town centre or within an edge of centre locations, proposals will be acceptable in principle, provided the site is accessible and well connected to the town centre.

No change

The development management process allows applicants to make the case as to why their specific use should be given special consideration. It is not necessary to set out all possible exceptions to policies within the Local Plan.

0128/01/009/DM9
(Option 2)/S

Ikea Properties Investments Ltd

Support

DM9 (Option 2)

Consider that this option is the most appropriate in terms of encouraging sustainable economic development and ensuring that the importance of trees is considered as a central component to the design approach and not separate from it.

No change

DM9 Option 1 will remain the preferred option for edge of centre and out of centre development.

6 Urban Design and Local Character

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0120/01/098//C	ASPRA		Comment			Comment in relation to question whether the preferred policy approach is deliverable. In the light of experience of the generally dismal quality of domestic architecture in this country since about 1930, the council will have to be very strong with developers to achieve a higher standard. One has only to look at the design of quite recent infilling blocks of flats to see how little has been secured so far.	Comment made regarding future application of policy. No change to policy requested.	No change	The move towards a character based approach should help to ensure higher quality, contextually appropriate development is implemented.
0127/01/015//O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>		Object			Page 92 6.139 In our view it would be helpful to recognise the potential that underused heritage assets on the register could bring to local communities and character and would ask the council to consider the additional sentence stating. The council will work with partners to secure creative solutions which contribute positively to local character and vitality.	Paragraph 6.139- add 'The council will work with partners to secure creative solutions which contribute positively to local character and vitality.'	Change	Add additional sentence to the end of paragraph 6.139: 'The council will seek to work with partners to secure creative solutions that would contribute positively to local character and vitality.'
0093/01/011/6.025/O	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>		Object		6.025	This paragraph states that in areas with a minimum PTAL of 6, the Council will consider developments with a reduced amount of parking. This appears to be a weakening of SP8 which states that the council will encourage car free development in centres, where there are PTALs of 5 and 6 and when a critical mass of development enables viable alternatives. Recommend this paragraph is reworded.	Reword paragraph to ensure policy does not contradict strategic policy SP8.	Change	This sentence has been moved to the "Car and Cycle Parking in New Development" section and the paragraph (now 10.14 has been reworded as follows "In locations such as the Croydon Metropolitan Centre or District Centres with a minimum PTAL rating of 5, the Council will consider developments with a reduced amount of parking".
0093/01/012/6.026/O	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>		Object		6.026	This paragraph states that cycle provision should be incorporated into proposals. Given that the London Plan sets out minimum requirements for cycle parking and that this is the only mention of cycle parking in the document, this should be reworded as "cycle provision must be incorporated into proposals".	Reword paragraph to include "cycle provision must be incorporated into proposals".	No change	Cycle provision is covered in the Chapter 6 (inc table 6.3) of the Transport in the Plan. To avoid repetition no change has been made.

0118/12/012/6.028/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	6.028	paragraphs 6.28-6.43: whilst the objective of the policy and supporting text is understood and supported, the need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clear and cost effective design solutions to be utilised where high design standards can still be achieved.	Paragraph 6.28-6.43 should provide opportunities for differentiation within design styles, material choices and public realm considerations and to also have regard to important viability considerations.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. Paragraphs 6.28 - 6.43 clearly relates to the application and quality of materials in context with the character of each area, therefore it is in line with national policies.
0118/12/011/6.028/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	6.028	Paragraph 6.28-6.43 should provide opportunities for differentiation within design styles, material choices and public realm considerations and to also have regard to important viability considerations. The prescription of material choices within new redevelopments should have regard to economic viability considerations and the use of new, simulated materials can still achieve high design standards whilst providing a more cost effective design and build approach.	Paragraph 6.28-6.43 should provide opportunities for differentiation within design styles, material choices and public realm considerations and to also have regard to important viability considerations.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. Paragraphs 6.28 - 6.41 clearly relates to the application and quality of materials in context with the character of each area, therefore it is in line with national policies.
0003/05/010/6.034/C	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Comment	6.034	Paragraph 6.34-6.39: council should give consideration to soft landscaping as well as permeable surfaces as part of a public realm package for development opportunities.	Consideration to soft landscaping as well as permeable surfaces.	No change	The Council requires proposals to submit details of both hard and soft landscaping and makes reference to SPG12 and the Public Realm Design Guide.
0127/01/002/6.034/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.034	Page 67 and 68 Lighting and Public Realm. Historic street furniture and public realm works can add to positively to local character and as such we would urge the council to consider incorporating a commitment to identify those historic features which add to local distinctiveness and to encourage retention and enhancement wherever possible.	The council to consider incorporating a commitment to identify those historic features which add to local distinctiveness and to encourage retention and enhancement wherever possible.	No change	Croydon Public Realm Design Guide provides detailed guidance on public realm design. Further consideration is required to include text in the Guide that recognises the positive contribution that historic street furniture may have upon the character of an area.

0127/01/003/6.040/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.040	Page 67 and 68 Lighting and Public Realm. Historic street furniture and public realm works can add to positively to local character and as such we would urge the council to consider incorporating a commitment to identify those historic features which add to local distinctiveness and to encourage retention and enhancement wherever possible.	The council to consider incorporating a commitment to identify those historic features which add to local distinctiveness and to encourage retention and enhancement wherever possible.	No change	Croydon Public Realm Design Guide provides detailed guidance on public realm design. Further consideration is required to include text in the Guide that recognises the positive contribution that historic street furniture may have upon the character of an area.
0127/01/011/6.126/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.126	Page 90 6.126. In respect of removing harmful alterations it would be advisable to refer to any available technical guidance and the desirability of trial panels being undertaken prior to removal of any of these surface treatments as these have the potential to cause significant damage to the underlying brickwork. We would recommend inclusion of the following phrase, The removal of harmful alterations...will be supported, where this can be demonstrably undertaken without harm to the significance of the heritage asset.	Amend paragraph 6.126. to refer to any available technical guidance and the desirability of trial panels being undertaken prior to removal of any of these surface treatments. Add the following phrase, 'The removal of harmful alterations...will be supported, where this can be demonstrably undertaken without harm to the significance of the heritage asset.'	Change	Amend the last sentence of paragraph 6.126 from 'Proposals that include the reinstatement of lost architectural or landscape features, for example traditional-style windows and doors and boundary treatments, or the removal or harmful alterations, such as the removal of paint or pebbledash render from brickwork, will be supported.' to 'Proposals that include the reinstatement of significant lost architectural or landscape features or the removal or harmful alterations, where this can be demonstrably undertaken without harm to the significance of the heritage asset, will be supported in principle.'
0127/01/012/6.128/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.128	Page 90 6.128. Conservation area designation introduces a general control over the demolition of unlisted buildings and provides a basis for planning policies whose objective is to conserve all aspects of character or appearance, including landscape and public spaces, that define an area's special interest. However, it does not specifically confer national significance but does require that as designated heritage assets they are subject management as set out in 1990 Act and the NPPF. We would therefore suggest amending the text as follows: Conservation areas are subject to management as designated heritage assets whilst LASC are considered to be local heritage assets.	Paragraph 6.128- Amend text as follows: Conservation areas are subject to management as designated heritage assets whilst LASC are considered to be local heritage assets.	Change	Paragraph 6.128- Amend text to 'Conservation areas are subject to management as designated heritage assets whilst LASC are considered to be local heritage assets.'
0127/01/013/6.134/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.134	Page 91 6.134 We would recommend amending the first sentence as follows, to better reflect national policy, Historic buildings should be maintained in their original use wherever possible unless fully justified by demonstration that this is necessary to secure its long term future viability.	Paragraph 6.134-amend the first sentence as follows, 'to better reflect national policy, Historic buildings should be maintained in their original use wherever possible unless fully justified by demonstration that this is necessary to secure its long term future viability.'	Change	Amend to 'Historic buildings should be maintained in their original use wherever possible unless fully justified by demonstration that this is necessary to secure its long term future viability' in 6.134, as recommended.

0127/01/014/6.138/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.138	Page 92 6.138 In our view the following amendment would strengthen the intention of the text 'The Council supports the principle of improving access to historic buildings but will ensure that works undertaken to achieve this are done so in the most creative manner possible and that any harm to significance is minimised and outweighed by the public benefit of securing access'.	Paragraph 6.138.-Amend the text to 'The Council supports the principle of improving access to historic buildings but will ensure that works undertaken to achieve this are done so in the most creative manner possible and that any harm to significance is minimised and outweighed by the public benefit of securing access'.	Change	Replace 6.138: 'The Council supports the principle of improving access to historic buildings but will ensure that works undertaken to achieve this are done so in the most sensitive and creative manner possible to reach a solution that causes the least harm to a building's significance.' with 'The Council supports the principle of improving access to historic buildings but will ensure that works undertaken to achieve this are done so in the most creative manner possible and that any harm to significance is minimised and outweighed by the public benefit of securing access'.
0127/01/016/6.140/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	6.140	Page 92 6.140. We would recommend stating that this requirement will be in addition to the recording requirements imposed in respect of the loss of nationally significant designated heritage assets.	Paragraph 6.140- Amend. Recommend stating that this requirement will be in addition to the recording requirements imposed in respect of the loss of nationally significant designated heritage assets.	Change	Add 'This is in addition to the recording requirements imposed in respect of the loss of nationally significant designated heritage assets' to 6.140.
0003/05/009/DM11 (Option 1)/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	DM11 (Option 1)	DM11.6: policy is welcomed and to be encouraged and has clear links to other section of the document and has clear links to other sections of the document and Strategic Objectives.		Welcome support	

0039/02/005/DM11 (Option 1)/O	Carmelle Bell	Object	DM11 (Option 1)	Policy DM11.3 of the consultation document sets out that proposals should ensure that the completed development will not result in an increase in odours, smoke, fumes dust and litter accumulation. It is considered that the policy should be amended to also ensure that new developments are not located in areas where future occupiers amenity would be affected by existing uses.	Amend Policy DM11.3 Option1 to .also ensure that new developments are not located in areas where future occupiers amenity would be affected by existing uses.	Change	Paragraph 6.27 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) states that when assessing applications consideration will be given to the impact upon existing and future occupiers. This includes visual amenity, overlooking, outlook, sunlight, daylight, noise, vibration, odour, smoke fumes, dust litter accumulation and the effect of traffic movement to, from and within the site. The Design and Character Policy DM11.3 has been updated and amalgamated into the Sustainable Design and Construction Policy to read as follows
	<i>Thames Water</i>						"a)Ensuring that future development, that may be liable to cause or be affected by pollution through air, noise, dust, or vibration, will not be detrimental to the health, safety and amenity of users of the site or surrounding land;" additionally, the reason justification makes reference to the requirement for noise assessment in noisy locations and for sound insulation to mitigate the impact on the residents of new developments.
0099/02/012/DM11 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM11 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 which supports SO4 & SO7.	Welcome support	
	<i>NHS Property Services</i>						

0101/01/006/DM11 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden Shirley Planning Forum	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM11 (Option 1)	<p>The policy includes a number of subjective phrases and words which are not adequately defined and can be misinterpreted. Examples include in DM11.3:</p> <p>'undue visual intrusion' - how undue is undue? 'maintain sunlight and daylight levels of both existing and new occupiers' - what does this mean? 'High quality and durable' materials cannot be quantified 'unobtrusively incorporated' services, utilities and facilities cannot be quantified What are 'facilities'?</p> <p>For the above reasons, the preferred policy approach is not deliverable and will not lead to a sustainable development.</p>	Define: undue visual intrusion, maintaining sunlight and daylight levels and facilities. Quantify: high quality and durable materials and unobtrusively incorporated services, utilities and facilities.	Change	<p>Parts of this policy have either been removed to avoid repetition with the Further Alterations to the London Plan (march 2015) or amalgated into the Sustainable Design and Construction policy and reason justification. The references to "undue" has been removed.</p> <p>In line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, policy DM11 sets out the quality that is expected from development proposals. The type of materials will be determined by the character of the area and this will not necessarily mean they will be the most expensive materials. It should be noted that the term high quality is included in paragraph 57 of NPPF.</p> <p>References to "facilities" has been clarified so that it now reads: "c)Services, utilities and rainwater goods will be discreetly incorporated within the building envelope"</p>
0102/01/006/DM11 (Option 1)/O	Joint LPA Receivers	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM11 (Option 1)	<p>It is not always achievable, or desirable' to retain existing trees and vegetation. It is unrealistic to insist upon retention in every case. Furthermore the phrase 'natural habitats' should be defined as it is unclear and potentially onerous.</p>	Add a definition for Natural Habitats	Change	<p>The Council's preference is to maintain all trees due to their contribution to the character of the area, biodiversity and green infrastructure. DM11.6 e provides sufficient provision for occasions where the loss of trees may outweigh the benefit of retention. Nevertheless, in accordance with policy 7.21 B of the London Plan, these trees will need to be replaced.</p> <p>A footnote with the definition of natural habitats has been added.</p>
0102/01/004/DM11 (Option 1)/O	Joint LPA Receivers	Object	Soundness - Consistent with National	DM11 (Option 1)	<p>This policy is unduly prescriptive, does not allow for design that enhances the character of the area and is contrary to para 60 of the NPPF.</p>		No change	<p>The requirements of DM11 are in accordance with paragraph 59 of the NPPF, which states that policies should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.</p>

0102/01/005/DM11 (Option 1)/O	Joint LPA Receivers	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM11 (Option 1)	Requiring materials and appearance of the 'highest quality' is too inflexible and could place undue financial burden on developers. Suggest 'highest quality form of development possible' is a better approach.	No change	In line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, policy DM11 sets out the quality that is expected from development proposals. The type of materials will be determined by the character of the area and this will not necessarily mean they will be the most expensive materials.	
0105/01/036/DM11 (Option 1)/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object		DM11 (Option 1)	<p>Clarification of DM11 Option1 , 11.3 is required as follows- DM11.3:To ensure the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining residential and commercial buildings is (are) protected or improved, proposals should:</p> <p>a. Ensure that it will not result in any undue visual intrusion or loss of privacy; What is the definition of 'undue'? This is subjective and therefore not sufficiently defined to mean anything if challenged. (Also see comment on DM10)- (Unless these statements are defined, the policy is flawed as it could not be implemented in practice.)English dictionary: usage; The use of undue in sentences such as there is no cause for undue alarm is redundant and should be avoided!</p> <p>B. Maintain sunlight and daylight levels for both existing and new occupiers; Does this mean that any new development should NOT cast a shadow over adjacent properties both existing and new, throughout the year from dawn to dusk? If not it is not clear what it does mean.</p>	<p>11.3 a: Define "undue" 11.3 b: Define whether this means that any development should not cast a shadow over adjacent properties both existing and new, throughout the year from dawn to dusk.</p>	Change	Parts of this policy has be amalgated into the Sustainable Design and Construction policy and reason justification. The references to "undue" has been removed and wording has been simplified.

0105/01/038/DM11
(Option 1)/O

Monks Orchard Residents Associa

Object

DM11 (Option 1)

Policy DM11.4 needs clarificaton
DM11.4 To ensure that the built
environment is of the highest quality,
proposals should demonstrate that:
a.The architectural detailing,
specification of materials and their
appearance is of the highest quality;
'Highest' (Subjective - can mean
tallest or can have other meanings -
so cannot be quantified. Who
defines, and what is meant by
highest Quality? "Highest
specification" Is subjective and could
be interpreted as height - cannot be
quantified unless a recognised
International, BS or EU specification
is provided.

b.High quality materials that are
durable, and respond to the local
character will be incorporated;
Again, incorrect use of unspecified
'High Quality and Durable' is not
definitive for how long is durable
unless specified these are subjective
statements and cannot be quantified,
so a developer can argue his
proposed materials are durable and
of high quality unless proven
otherwise! Again statement is
subjective and cannot be quantified
unless International, BS or EU
specification is provided.

And
c.Services, utilities and facilities will
be unobtrusively incorporated within
the building envelope

11.4:

a) Quantify "highest" using recognised
international, BS or EU specification

b) Quantify "high quality and durable"
using recognised international, BS or EU
specification

c) Clarify services, utilities and facilities
will be unobtrusively incorporated within
the building envelope

Change

Parts of this policy have
either been removed to
avoid repetition with the
Further Alterations to the
London Plan (March 2015)
or amalgamated into the
Sustainable Design and
Construction policy and
reason justification. The
references to "undue" have
been removed.

In line with paragraph 58 of
the NPPF, policy DM11 sets
out the quality that is
expected from development
proposals. The type of
materials will be determined
by the character of the area
and this will not necessarily
mean they will be the most
expensive materials. It
should be noted that the
term high quality is included
in paragraph 57 of NPPF.

It is not possible to provide
international, BS or EU
specifications due to the
quantity of materials
available and if this was
done it would result in a
policy that is too prescriptive
and not in accordance with
the NPPF

References to facilities have
been clarified so that it now
reads:
"c)Services, utilities and
rainwater goods will be
discreetly incorporated within
the building envelope"

The policy approach is not deliverable unless clarification of DM11 Option1 , 11.3 and 11.4 is made:-details fo clarifications required- DM11.3.To ensure the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining residential and commercial buildings is (are) protected or improved, proposals should:

a. Ensure that it will not result in any undue visual intrusion or loss of privacy;
What is the definition of 'undue'? This is subjective and therefore not sufficiently defined to mean anything if challenged. (Also see comment on DM10)- (Unless these statements are defined, the policy is flawed as it could not be implemented in practice.)English dictionary: usage; The use of undue in sentences such as there is no cause for undue alarm is redundant and should be avoided!

b. Maintain sunlight and daylight levels for both existing and new occupiers;
Does this mean that any new development should NOT cast a shadow over adjacent properties both existing and new, throughout the year from dawn to dusk? If not it is not clear what it does mean.

Policy DM11.4 needs clarificaton
DM11.4 To ensure that the built environment is of the highest quality, proposals should demonstrate that:
a.The architectural detailing, specification of materials and their appearance is of the highest quality; 'Highest' (Subjective - can mean tallest or can have other meanings - so cannot be quantified. Who defines, and what is meant by highest Quality? "Highest specification" Is subjective and could be interpreted as height - cannot be quantified unless a recognised International, BS or EU specification is provided.

b.High quality materials that are durable, and respond to the local character will be incorporated;
Again, incorrect use of unspecified 'High Quality and Durable' is not definitive for how long is durable unless specified these are subjective statements and cannot be quantified, so a developer can argue his proposed materials are durable and of high quality unless proven otherwise! Again statement is subjective and cannot be quantified unless International, BS or EU specification is provided.

And
c.Services, utilities and facilities will be unobtrusively incorporated within

11.3 a: Define "undue"
11.3 b: Define whether this means that any development should not cast a shadow over adjacent properties both existing and new, throughout the year from dawn to dusk.

Parts of this policy have either been removed to avoid repetition with the Further Alterations to the London Plan (March 2015) or amalgamated into the Sustainable Design and Construction policy and reason justification. The references to "undue" have been removed.

In line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, policy DM11 sets out the quality that is expected from development proposals. The type of materials will be determined by the character of the area and this will not necessarily mean they will be the most expensive materials. It should be noted that the term high quality is included in paragraph 57 of NPPF.

It is not possible to provide international, BS or EU specifications due to the quantity of materials available and if this was done it would result in a policy that is too prescriptive and not in accordance with the NPPF

References to facilities have been clarified so that it now reads:
"c)Services, utilities and rainwater goods will be discreetly incorporated within the building envelope"

0105/01/035/DM11 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM11 (Option 1)	Approve 11.1 and 11.2 of Option 1 BUT NOT 11.3, and 11.4 unless clarified.	11.3 and 11.4 should be clarified.	Change	Parts of this policy have either been removed to avoid repetition with the Further Alterations to the London Plan (March 2015) or amalgamated into the Sustainable Design and Construction policy and reason justification. The references to "undue" have been removed.
							In line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, policy DM11 sets out the quality that is expected from development proposals. The type of materials will be determined by the character of the area and this will not necessarily mean they will be the most expensive materials. It should be noted that the term high quality is included in paragraph 57 of NPPF.
							It is not possible to provide international, BS or EU specifications due to the quantity of materials available and if this was done it would result in a policy that is too prescriptive and not in accordance with the NPPF
							References to facilities have been clarified so that it now reads: "c)Services, utilities and rainwater goods will be discreetly incorporated within the building envelope"
0118/12/013/DM11 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM11 (Option 1)	DM11: the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	Paragraph 6.28-6.43 should provide opportunities for differentiation within design styles, material choices and public realm considerations and to also have regard to important viability considerations.	No change	The policies within DM11 align with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. References to the high quality materials are not primarily about the cost, but of the visual and physical relationship of the materials and the impact that this will have upon the setting and character of the local area.

0118/12/014/DM11 (Option 1)/S	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Support	DM11 (Option 1)	DM11: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	Paragraph 6.28-6.43 should provide opportunities for differentiation within design styles, material choices and public realm considerations and to also have regard to important viability considerations.	No change	National Planning Policy Framework states (paragraph 59) that 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally'. Paragraphs 6.28 - 6.43 clearly relates to the application and quality of materials in context with the character of each area, therefore it is in line with national policies.
0120/01/007/DM11 (Option 1)/S	<i>ASPRA</i>	Support	DM11 (Option 1)	DM11 Preferred Policy - it is essential for Addiscombe Place that the preferred Option 1 is adopted -each different place within Addiscombe Place will have its character protected and enhanced.		Welcome support	
0120/01/097/DM11 (Option 1)/S	<i>ASPRA</i>	Support	DM11 (Option 1)	Policy DM11.4 is supported as it is highly desirable to attain high architectural and design quality in all new development. Being surrounded by attractive development adds so much to the quality of life.		Welcome support	

0130/01/012/DM11 (Option 1)/O	The Croydon Partnership	Object	DM11 (Option 1)	<p>We do consider, however, that draft Policy DM11.3 (specifically Criterion (b), © and (d)) is overly prescriptive and does not allow for sufficient flexibility for development proposals to come forward which are considered acceptable against the relevant technical assessment criteria. For instance, a development could come forward that leads to a slight reduction in the existing level of sunlight and daylight for existing and new occupiers, but which meets the relevant technical sunlight and daylight assessment criteria. However, such a development would not 'maintain' the existing sunlight and daylight levels and would therefore be contrary to Criterion (b) of Policy DM11.3 as drafted. This drafting is not therefore considered appropriate. Similarly, a development proposal could lead to a slight increase in noise and vibration levels, or odours, smoke, fumes, dust and litter, but could be deemed acceptable when assessed in the supporting Environmental Statement; the current wording of Criterion © and (d) would, however, mean that the proposal was contrary to Policy DM11.3. Again, therefore, this drafting is not considered appropriate; it should be the case that the level of significance of change is the determining factor for compliance with this policy.</p>	Option1, Policy DM11.3 (specifically Criterion (b), (c) and (d)) should be amended to allow flexibility for development proposals to come forward which are considered acceptable against the relevant technical assessment criteria. It should be the case that the level of significance of change is the determining factor for compliance with policy DM11.3.	Change	The policy DM11.3 has been removed. References to visual intrusion, loss of privacy, noise and vibration are covered with the Mayor of London's Housing SPG (November 2012).
0130/01/011/DM11 (Option 1)/S	The Croydon Partnership	Support	DM11 (Option 1)	<p>Draft Policy DM11 seeks to replace UDP Policies UD2 to UD14 in relation to urban design and local character and ensure that the Croydon Local Plan is aligned to the NPPF and the London Plan. We support the Council's Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') for draft Policy DM11.1, DM11.2, DM11.4, DM11.5, DM11.6 and DM11.7 and consider these elements of Policy DM11, as drafted, to be in line with national and regional policy guidance.</p>	Welcome support		
0127/01/004/DM12 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish English Heritage	Object	DM12 (Option 1)	<p>Page 70 Option 1 DM12.2 b. We would suggest that the option is modified to say to Retain and incorporate historic shop fronts etc. to avoid confusion with historically informed shop front designs.</p>	Modify Option1 DM12.2b.	Change	Policy DM12.2b has been changed to include the word 'Retain and incorporate historic shop fronts...'

0130/01/013/DM12 (Option 1)/O	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Object		DM12 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM12 (and in particular DM12.1) seeks to ensure that shop fronts are attractive, secure and of a high quality design by requiring development proposals to respect the scale, character, materials and features of the buildings that form part of, and to conform with the Council's SPD on shop front design and security. Whilst we support the principles of Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option), we are not aware that an SPD exists for shop front design and security, but instead applicants should refer to the Council's 'Shop Fronts and Signs' SPG No. 1 (March 1996) and the subsequent addendum on shop front security (April 2012), as confirmed in the Council's consultation document. On this basis we question whether the Council should be referring to a document that does not exist.	In Policy DM12 (Shopfront Design and Security) references to the Council's SPG No.1 and its addendum have been amended to read 'Shopfronts and Signs SPG No. 1" (March 1996) and "Shop Front Security Addendum to SPG No.1" (April 2012).	Change	Policy DM12b will be amended to reference the Council's 'Shop Fronts and Signs' SPG No. 1 (March 1996) and the subsequent addendum on shop front security (April 2012).
0099/02/013/DM13 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM13 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 which supports SO4 & SO7.		Welcome support	
0105/01/040/DM13 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM13 (Option 1)	DM13.1 and 2 - Option1 approve but The preferred option does not consider: The distance of refuse bins storage from the main access point. The use of communal storage/collection areas Refuse and recycling operators walking distance Turning head dimensions for refuse/recycling vehicles. This approach will not therefore meet Croydon's strategic policies	The preferred option should consider the distance of refuse bins storage from the main access point, the use of communal storage/collection areas, refuse and recycling operators walking distance, turning head dimensions for refuse/recycling vehicles.	Change	Poicy 13 was drafted following consultation from the Council's Public Realm and Safety Department. Paragraphs 6.71 and 6.72 places emphasis on the need to consult with the Council's Public Realm and Safety department to ensure current standards are met. These standards may change throughout the life of the Plan therefore have not been included in this policy. Nevertheless, the policy has been updated to place greater emphasis on the need to ensure refuse and recycling facilities are conveniently located.
0118/14/004/DM13 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM13 (Option 1)	DM13: the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	The policy should allow for an flexible interpretation on a case by case basis.	No change	All policies within the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) including DM13 will be applied on a case by case basis. However, the need to provide refuse and recycling facilities is not optional. Therefore, the Council does not agree with this view.
0118/14/003/DM13 (Option 1)/S	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Support		DM13 (Option 1)	DM13: the preferred policy approach is deliverable.		Welcome support	

0118/14/002/DM13 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM13 (Option 1)	Whilst the objective of the policy and supporting text is understood and supported, the need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clear and design solutions utilised where accessible design standards can still be achieved.	The policy should allow for an flexible interpretation on a case by case basis.	No change	All policies within the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) including DM13 will be applied on a case by case basis. However, the need to provide refuse and recycling facilities is not optional. In order for sites to be serviced these will need to meet the accessibility criteria in DM13.2. Therefore, the Council does not agree with this view.
0118/14/001/DM13 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM13 (Option 1)	Whilst it is supported that development schemes should allow for the servicing or waste and recycling facilities, the policy should make clear that the requirements should be met within key areas within a development site and that a pragmatic and site specific interpretation of such will be applied at detailed design stage and it should be made clear that the prescriptive application of this policy will not apply.	Policy should make clearer the requirements for servicing, waste and recycling facilities will be applied on a pragmatic and site specific basis.	No change	All policies within the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) including DM13 will be applied on a case by case basis. However, the need to provide refuse and recycling facilities is not optional. Therefore, the Council does not agree with this view.
0130/01/014/DM13 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support		DM13 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM13 seeks to provide clear guidance on the location and design of refuse and recycling facilities within developments that come forward in the Borough. The Council's 'Preferred Option' (as set out in DM13.1 and DM13.2) seeks to ensure that the location and design of refuse and recycling facilities are treated as an integral element of the overall design through the implementation of a number of measures and seeks to ensure that such facilities are easily accessible by operators. We support Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') for Draft Policy DM13 and consider it to be a sensible approach.		Welcome support	
0099/02/014/DM14 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM14 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 which supports SO4 & SO7.		Welcome support	

0118/15/004/DM14 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM14 (Option 1)	DM14: the preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	The policy should be less prescriptive.	No change	Policy DM14 allows sufficient scope for innovation and creative ways of implementing public art within developments. This could include incorporating public art element within the building envelope or within lighting or play equipment. Policy DM15 must be considered in conjunction with the other policies within the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) including Policy DM19 sustainable Design and Construction. Therefore the Council does not agree with this view.
0118/15/001/DM14 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM14 (Option 1)	The design requirements for the provision of public art in all major developments is not supported because it is overly prescriptive and does not allow for detailed site considerations and viability constraints to be taken into account.	The policy should be less prescriptive.	No change	Policy DM14 allows sufficient scope for innovation and creative ways of implementing public art within developments. This could include incorporating public art element within the building envelope or within lighting or play equipment. Therefore the Council does not agree with this view.
0118/15/002/DM14 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM14 (Option 1)	The requirement to engage with the local community in the creation of public art adds an unnecessary level of bureaucracy to the development process.	"Where appropriate" should be added to the policy to make it clear that it is an aspiration rather than a requirement.	No change	The requirement to engage with the local community in the creation of public art (policy DM14e) is necessary to ensure each piece of public art is innovative, appropriate for each area and encourages ownership of the art within the local community.
0118/15/003/DM14 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM14 (Option 1)	DM14: the preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	The policy should be less prescriptive.	No change	Policy DM14 allows sufficient scope for innovation and creative ways of implementing public art within developments. This could include incorporating public art element within the building envelope or within lighting or play equipment. Therefore the Council does not agree with this view.
0121/01/015/DM14 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object	DM14 (Option 1)	Agree with Option 1, but need to ensure that this is properly encouraged. Should be included as part of a planning application.	Ensure DM14 Option 1 is included as part of a planning application.	No change	DM14 Option 1 is applicable to all major planning applications.
0122/02/013/DM14 (Option 1)/S	Mrs Hilary Chelminski <i>Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA</i>	Support	DM14 (Option 1)	Support the inclusion of this policy.		Welcome support	

0130/01/015/DM14 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support		DM14 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM13 seeks to provide clear guidance on the location and design of refuse and recycling facilities within developments that come forward in the Borough. The Council's 'Preferred Option' (as set out in DM13.1 and DM13.2) seeks to ensure that the location and design of refuse and recycling facilities are treated as an integral element of the overall design through the implementation of a number of measures and seeks to ensure that such facilities are easily accessible by operators. We support Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') for Draft Policy DM13 and consider it to be a sensible approach.		Welcome support	
0026/02/005/DM15 (Option 1)/S	<i>Berkeley Homes PLC</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM15 (Option 1)	A policy which assesses tall buildings on a site by site basis and the merits of a proposal is welcomed. Positively framed to enable well designed buildings to be deliverable.		Welcome support	
0099/02/015/DM15 (Option 1)/C	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Comment	Soundness - Effective	DM15 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 with the qualification that design elements should be considered in developments to negate the potential negative impact on mental health caused by isolation in large blocks of flats and the loss of light and privacy in adjoining residences.		No change	The provision of communal amenity is intended to provide opportunities to improve interaction between residents, as set out in DM1: Private and communal outdoor amenity space for new residential development. Policy DM11.3 and paragraph 6.27 sets out the requirement to consider the impact on light and privacy to adjoining residences and future occupiers.
0118/04/002/DM15 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM15 (Option 1)	Whist the objective of the policy and supporting text is understood and supported, the need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clearer and cost effective design solutions to be utilised where sustainable and high design standards can still be achieved.	The need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clearer.	No change	All policies within the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) including DM15 will be applied on a case by case basis.
0118/04/004/DM15 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		DM15 (Option 1)	DM15: The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.	The need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clearer.	No change	Policy DM15 must be considered in conjunction with the other policies within the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) including Policy DM19 sustainable Design and Construction.

0118/04/003/DM15 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM15 (Option 1)	DM15: the preferred policy approach is not deliverable.	The need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clearer.	No change	DM15 sets out location where new development can be significantly taller or larger than the predominant scale and massing of buildings. These include locations identified in Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework and Masterplans. This policy must be considered in conjunction with the other policies within the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options). These policies provide some flexibility to allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character.
0118/04/001/DM15 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM15 (Option 1)	The prescription of PTAL rating of 4 as the threshold for the acceptability of tall buildings as overly restrictive. There may be locations suited to tall buildings of 6 storeys or otherwise which are in PTAL ratings of 3/4 and the policy would prejudice such redevelopments.	The policy should be amended at point b to provide flexibility to state that they are in a high PTAL rating and/or have direct public transport access to Croydon Opportunity Area.	No change	The agreed locations for tall and large buildings are within Masterplan areas and the Croydon Opportunity Area. Generally these have a PTAL rating of at least 4.
0121/01/016/DM15 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object	DM15 (Option 1)	Option 1 is ok, but there must be some flexibility of 'building tall' in other areas where it can be justified.	Amend Option1 Policy 15 to allow some flexibility of 'building tall' in other areas where it can be justified.	No change	DM15 sets out location where new development can be significantly taller or larger than the predominant scale and massing of buildings. These include locations identified in Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework and Masterplans. This policy must be considered in conjunction with the other policies within the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options). These policies provide some flexibility to allow for growth whilst respecting existing scale and character.
0127/01/005/DM15 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	DM15 (Option 1)	Page 30 Policy DM15 In light of the Planning Inspectors decision in respect of the Nunhead Peckham AAP we would consider it appropriate to incorporate a policy which states that tall buildings be of should be of exceptional quality and design and should conserve or enhance the significance of the area's heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment, including conservation areas and listed and locally listed buildings.	Incorporate a policy which states that tall buildings be of should be of exceptional quality and design and should conserve or enhance the significance of the area's heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment, including conservation areas and listed and locally listed buildings.	Change	Policy DM15c has been amended to read 'The design should be of exceptional quality and demonstrate that a sensitive approach has been taken in the articulation and composition of the building form which is proportionate to its scale.'

0130/01/016/DM15
(Option 1)/S

The Croydon Partnership

Support

DM15 (Option 1)

Draft Policy DM15 seeks to bring Croydon's Local Plan in line with the adopted Croydon OAPF by controlling the location of tall and large buildings within the Borough. Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') seeks to ensure that tall or large buildings respect and enhance local character and do not harm the setting of heritage settings; be located in the areas identified for such buildings as set out in the OAPF; be in locations which have a minimum PTAL rating of 4; and incorporate a sensitive approach to articulation and composition which is proportionate to their scale. We support Option 1 in this respect and consider it sensible to introduce such a policy to bring the Croydon Local Plan in line with the OAPF.

Welcome support

0103/01/009/DM16
(Option 1)/O

Persimmon Homes

Object

DM16 (Option 1)

Support the inclusion of a new panorama from Parkway to Addington Village and Shirley Hills. However, there is no description of what can be seen and there is no indication of what is to be protected, not any assessment methodology to consider how this panorama may be affected.

Significant further clarification is required for this change to policy to be considered sound.

No change

The Local Designated Landmarks that appear in each Local Designated View and in Croydon Panoramas are listed in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies- Partial Review, Appendix 5. Further evidence of the assessment of the panoramas and views identifying those that met the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The viewpoints of all the Local Designated Views and Croydon Panoramas are indicated in the 'Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options)'.
The proposed policy DM17 option 1, defines what the Council will consider in the assessment of the impact of proposed development on the Local Designated Views, Croydon Panoramas and Local Designated Landmarks.

0103/01/007/DM16
(Option 1)/O

Persimmon Homes

Object

DM16 (Option 1)

We support your decision to de-designate Local View 7 (LV7) (New Addington to Addington Palace) and to include a new panorama from Parkway to Addington Village and Shirley Hills.
However, there is insufficient data and information in this policy to consider whether it will be effective. There is no description of the viewing point, no description of what can be seen, and no indication as to why this viewpoint is important.

Significant further clarification is required on what can be seen and as to why this new viewpoint and panorama is important, in order to this change in policy to be considered sound.

No change

The viewpoint meets the criteria for viewpoints. The Local Designated Landmarks that appear in each Local Designated View and in Croydon Panoramas are listed in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies- Partial Review, Appendix 5. Further evidence of the assessment of the panoramas and views identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The viewpoints of all the Local Designated Views and Croydon Panoramas are indicated in the 'Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).'

The proposed policy DM17 option 1, defines what the Council will consider in the assessment of the impact of proposed development on the Local Designated Views, Croydon Panoramas and Local Designated Landmarks.

0103/01/008/DM16
(Option 1)/O

Persimmon Homes

Object

DM16 (Option 1)

DM16 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.

We support your decision to de-designate Local View 7 (LV7) (New Addington to Addington Palace) and to include a new panorama from Parkway to Addington Village and Shirley Hills. However, there is insufficient data and information in this policy to consider whether it will be effective. There is no description of the viewing point, no description of what can be seen, and no indication as to why this viewpoint is important. There is no indication of what is to be protected, nor any assessment methodology to consider how this panorama may be affected. Significant further clarification is required on these matters in order for this change to policy to be considered sound.

No change

The viewpoint has been revised from the original UDP View LV7 viewpoint location as this provides a wider view of the panorama and therefore meets the assessment criteria of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) which states 'the viewpoint selected is where the widest panorama can be viewed. It also meets the other two parts of this assessment criteria - is a view of substantial parts of the borough', and 'provides the clearest view with the least obstructions of subject matter'. The viewpoint meets the criteria for viewpoints. The Local Designated Landmarks that appear in each Local Designated View and in Croydon Panoramas are listed in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies - Partial Review, Appendix 5. Further evidence of the assessment of the panoramas and views identifying those that met the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The viewpoints of all the Local Designated Views and Croydon Panoramas are indicated in the 'Changes to the Policies Map arising from Proposals contained within the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options)'. The proposed policy DM17 option 1, defines what the Council will consider in the assessment of the impact of proposed development on the Local Designated Views, Croydon Panoramas and Local Designated Landmarks.

0114/01/001/DM16
(Option 1)/S

Mr Ian Walker

Support

DM16 (Option 1)

Support DM16 Option One

Welcome support

Croydon Airport Society

0120/01/096/DM16 (Option 1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM16 (Option 1)	The preferred policy approach enables sustainable development? - Yes, because it will create a nice place to look out onto. What more would one want from a place where we live.	No change- Support Policy DM16	Welcome support	
0120/01/095/DM16 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Option 1)	The policy DM16 is deliverable, but in Addiscombe Place there are no views? There are some listed in the Draft consultation document for East India Conservation Area, and there must be more available from each of our residents association. We repeat this in the Part One of our submission.	DM16 is deliverable, but reconsider if there are any views that can be Local Designated Views, identified in the Draft consultation document for East India Conservation Area, and as listed in previous comments 89-93.	Change	The Council has assessed all suggested views in the Addiscombe Place and from the East India Conservation Area document that meet the assessment criteria in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) for Local Designated Views and Croydon Panoramas. A view from near the Sandilands tramstop of the proposed Local Designated Landmark No1, Croydon, has been identified as meeting the criteria.
0120/01/033/DM16 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Option 1)	Views: From South end (top) of Northampton Road to the Canary Wharf complex - a delightful distant Christmas tree each December.	Add View to Local Designated Views	No change	Views outside the borough are not proposed for designation as the Council has no control over development proposals beyond the borough boundary.
0120/01/032/DM16 (Option 1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Option 1)	Landmarks:- Addiscombe Farm, Bingham Corner, St Mildred's Church and Our Lady of the Annunciation RC Church both in Bingham Road, Old Post Office/BT building Lower Addiscombe Road.	Proposed landmarks Addiscombe Farm, Bingham Corner, St Mildred's Church and Our Lady of the Annunciation RC Church both in Bingham Road, Old Post Office/BT building Lower Addiscombe Road.- Add to Table 6.1	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/094/DM16 (Option 1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM16 (Option 1)	Agreed-The preferred policy approach is the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. It is necessary to have a bigger picture for a place. It recognises landmarks as part of the view	No change - support Policy DM16.	Welcome support	

0129/01/007/DM16 (Option 1)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM16 (Option 1)	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives as set out in the document but raises concerns outside the narrow scope it sets. The Leslie Arms and former Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park are as prominent local marks as other landmarks listed. They are distinctive old buildings that give a sense of place and should be noted as such. Other items of note include East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene, London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	Leslie Arms and the former Ashburton Library should be landmarks, as well as East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene and London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0129/01/011/DM16 (Option 1)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM16 (Option 1)	The policy approach meets the narrow and immediate strategic objectives but is not sustainable. The Leslie Arms and former Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park are as prominent local marks as other landmarks listed. They are distinctive old buildings that give a sense of place and should be noted as such. Other items of note include East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene, London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	Leslie Arms and the former Ashburton Library should be landmarks, as well as East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene and London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0129/01/010/DM16 (Option 2)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM16 (Option 2)	The policy approach is deliverable within the parameters set out in the document but does not address very pertinent concerns. The Leslie Arms and former Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park are as prominent local marks as other landmarks listed. They are distinctive old buildings that give a sense of place and should be noted as such. Other items of note include East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene, London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	Leslie Arms and the former Ashburton Library should be landmarks, as well as East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene and London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0129/01/008/DM16 (Option 2)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM16 (Option 2)	The policy approach addresses strategic objectives as set out in the document but raises concerns outside the narrow scope it sets. The Leslie Arms and former Ashburton Library in Ashburton Park are as prominent local marks as other landmarks listed. They are distinctive old buildings that give a sense of place and should be noted as such. Other items of note include East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene, London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	Leslie Arms and the former Ashburton Library should be landmarks, as well as East India Houses, Clyde Hall, St Mary Magdelene and London Metropolitan Cattle Trough.	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0092/01/012/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	<i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	The RRA would like to suggest these additional viewpoints to the list on Table 6.1 and Appendix 6.	From the "Donkey Field" on Riddlesdown Common (behind circa 88 Ingleboro Drive) looking north towards Croydon and Central London.	No change	The Council considered whether this proposal for a Local Designated view metsthe assessment criteria of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) for a panorama, but the subject matter is substantially of London and there are no Croydon landmarks clearly visible. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0092/01/011/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	<i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	The RRA would like to suggest these additional viewpoints to the list on Table 6.1 and Appendix 6.	Top of Coombe Wood Hill/end of Ingleboro Drive looking north over Croydon, and beyond to the north and west towards central and north London.	No change	The Council considered whether this proposal for a Local Designated view met the assessment criteria of the Croyd Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0101/01/007/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Shirley Windmill should have been included in the list of local landmarks.	Add Shirley Windmill to the list of Local Landmarks	Change	The Council reviewed this proposal for a Designated Local Landmark against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark meets the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0114/01/007/DM16 (Table 6.1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment		DM16 (Table 6.1)	Airport House and the former Airport Gate House, Purley Way to be designated as a Landmark because the former Gate House is on the English Heritage "Heritage at Risk" Register ref 1079299 and both buildings are Grade II listed.	Airport House and the former Airport Gate house to be a landmark.	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria as there is only one view within the borough of the Control Tower from Purley Way playing fields and none in the proposed Local Designated Views or Panoramas. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0119/01/001/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	<i>Tandridge District Council</i>	Object		DM16 (Table 6.1)	The proposed new Local View Designated View from Kenley Common of Riddlesdown and housing in the valley and viaduct is supported in principle. However, the District Council would wish to be consulted on the location of the proposed viewpoint bearing in mind the close proximity of Tandridge District to this area.	Consult Tandridge on location on proposed viewpoint.	Change	Maps of viewpoint locations will be made available as supporting evidence for the next consultation on the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals. The viewpoint has been adjusted and its TQ map reference is 533218,158728 . The view is now proposed as a Panorama as it is a very wide view of Riddlesdown.

0120/01/066/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks' It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as St Mary Magdalene with St Martin	Add St Mary Magdalene with St Martin to Table 6.1,	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/068/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	View from Sandilands Road towards North	Add view to Local Designated Views on Table 6.1- From Sandilands Road towards North	No change	The Council has assessed this proposal for a Local Designated view and it does not meet the assessment criteria set out of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/064/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Policy DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks' It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as The Oval pub building,	Add the Oval pub building to Table 6.1,	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/081/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Views: From South end (top) of Northampton Road to the Canary Wharf complex - a delightful distant Christmas tree each December.	Add view From South end (top) of Northampton Road to the Canary Wharf complex to Table 6.1 as a Local Designated View.	No change	Views outside the borough are not proposed for designation as the Council has no control over development proposals beyond the borough boundary.

0120/01/087/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Landmarks- Herons Croft,
Addiscombe Road

Landmarks- Herons Croft, Addiscombe
Road- Add to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/067/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Important landmark: The Old Ashburton Library, Pavilion & Ashburton Park have been a matter of concern, the building having been empty for so long that it has fallen into disrepair. It is generally felt that this would lend itself to becoming a very good café/restaurant for the community, perhaps in conjunction with other community groups & projects & also some private or commercial use in the remaining & upper spaces.

Important landmark: The Old Ashburton Library, Pavilion & Ashburton Park add to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/082/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Other Landmarks, some mentioned in formal response:
Ashburton Library,

Add Ashburton Library to Table 6.1 as Landmark.

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/065/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as lower Addiscombe Church of the Nazarene (near the small Co-op on lower Addiscombe Rd,

Add lower Addiscombe Church of the Nazarene (near the small Co-op on lower Addiscombe Rd to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/079/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Add Our Lady of the Annunciation RC Church in Bingham Road to Landmarks

Add Our Lady of the Annunciation RC Church in Bingham Road to Landmarks in Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).The suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/093/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

The 16 PoC for Addiscombe doesn't consider it needs 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as the former Ashburton Library, The Leslie Arms, East India Houses at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road, Churches and the Cattle Trough. These sit outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as landmarks.

Addiscombe Place should have Views and Landmarks. Add the Cattle Trough to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/092/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

The 16 PoC for Addiscombe doesn't consider it needs 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as the former Ashburton Library, The Leslie Arms, East India Houses at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road, Churches and the Cattle Trough. These sit outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as landmarks.

Addiscombe Place should have Views and Landmarks. Add Churches to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/091/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

The 16 PoC for Addiscombe doesn't consider it needs 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as the former Ashburton Library, The Leslie Arms, East India Houses at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road, Churches and the Cattle Trough. These sit outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as landmarks.

Addiscombe Place should have Views and Landmarks. Add East India Houses at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/090/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

The 16 PoC for Addiscombe doesn't consider it needs 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as the former Ashburton Library, The Leslie Arms, East India Houses at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road, Churches and the Cattle Trough. These sit outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as landmarks.

Addiscombe Place should have Views and Landmarks. Add The Leslie Arms, to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/088/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Landmark-South London Ismaili
Community Centre Addiscombe
Road.

Add South London Ismaili Community
Centre Addiscombe Road to Table 6.1 as
a Landmark.

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/086/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Landmark-the Cattle Trough in
Morland Road

Add the Cattle Trough in Morland Road to
Table 6.1 as a Landmark

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/085/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Other Landmarks, some mentioned
in formal response: Churches in
Morland Road,

Add Churches a in Morland Road, to
Table 6.1 as Landmarks

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/073/DM16 (Table 6.1)/S	ASPRA	Support	DM16 (Table 6.1)	LANDMARKS & VIEWS -Park Hill Recreation Ground - especially the Water Tower	Support Water Tower being included in Table 6.1 as a landmark.	Welcome support	
0120/01/083/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Other Landmarks, some mentioned in formal response: The Leslie Arms,	Add The Leslie Arms to Table 6.1 as a Landmark	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/070/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Views- From Sandilands tram stop Addiscombe Road towards NLA tower	Add View to Local Designated Views in Table 6.1-from Sandilands tram stop Addiscombe Road towards NLA tower	Change	The Council will add this proposal for a Local Designated view to the list of Views to be consulted on as it meets the assessment criteria of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/080/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Add Old Post Office/BT building Lower Addiscombe Road to Landmarks	Add Old Post Office/BT building Lower Addiscombe Road to Table 6.1 as a Landmark	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).The suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/089/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

The 16 PoC for Addiscombe doesn't consider it needs 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as the former Ashburton Library, The Leslie Arms, East India Houses at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road, Churches and the Cattle Trough. These sit outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as landmarks.

Addiscombe Place should have Views and Landmarks. Add Ashburton Library to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/078/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Landmark:- St Mildred's Church , Bingham Road

Add landmark St Mildred's Church , Bingham Road to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/077/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Landmarks: Addiscombe Farm, Bingham Corner,

Add to Table 6.1 as a Landmark: Addiscombe Farm, Bingham Corner,

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/076/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	LANDMARKS & VIEWS -St Bernard's conservation area in Chichester Road	Add -St Bernard's conservation area in Chichester Road to Table 6.1 as a landmark.	No change	A conservation area cannot be a landmark or local view as it does not meet the criteria in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) for Local Designated Landmarks and Views.
0120/01/075/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	LANDMARKS & VIEWS - St Matthew's Church	Add St Matthew's Church to Table 6.1 as a landmark	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).These suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas,views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0120/01/074/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Landmarks and views- The triangle of open space off Cotelands by Park Hill Infants School	Add the triangle of open space off Cotelands by Park Hill Infants School to Table 6.1 as a local designated view and landmark.	No change	An open space cannot be a landmark or local view as it does not meet the criteria in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) paragraphs 6.100 to 6.103. It can only be viewed in close proximity due to the surrounding topography.
0120/01/072/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Add Park Hill Recreation Ground to the views and landmarks	Add Park Hill Recreation Ground to Table 6.1 as a Local Designated View and landmark	No change	A park cannot be a Local Designated Landmark or Local Designated View as it does not meet the assessment criteria.
0120/01/071/DM16 (Table 6.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM16 (Table 6.1)	Add Lloyd Park to Views and Landmarks	Add Lloyd Park to Table 6.1 as a Local Designated View and Landmark	No change	A park cannot be a landmark or local view as it does not meet the criteria in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies (Preferred and Alternative Options) . It can only be viewed in close proximity due to the surrounding topography.

0120/01/084/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Other Landmarks, some mentioned in formal response: East India Company Houses (Ashleigh and India House - at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road),

Add East India Company Houses (Ashleigh and India House - at corner of Addiscombe Road and Clyde Road), to Table 6.1 as Landmarks

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/060/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Policy DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks' Add East India Houses. This sits outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as a landmark.

Add East India Houses to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/059/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Policy DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks' It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as The Leslie Arms. This sits outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as a landmark.

Add The Leslie Arms to Landmarks to Table 6.1

No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). This suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/061/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Policy DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as Churches in Addiscombe. This sits outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as a landmark.

Add Churches in Addiscombe to Table 6.1 No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/062/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Policy DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as Cattle Trough. This sits outside DM29.2 & DM29.1 and should be recognised as a landmark.

Add Cattle Trough to Table 6.1 No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The suggested landmark does not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0120/01/063/DM16
(Table 6.1)/O

ASPRA

Object

DM16 (Table 6.1)

Policy DM16 & Appendix 6 'Views and Landmarks'
It should be there in order to recognise Landmarks such as Clyde Hall

Add Clyde Hall to Table 6.1 No change

The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). The suggested landmark do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).

0101/01/014/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM17 (Option 1)	Cheston Avenue Conservation Area - the maisonettes were included on the map as a conservation area.		No change	The Cheston Avenue maisonettes are an existing Local Area of Special Character, which was shown on the Proposals Map.
0114/01/014/DM17 (Option 1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment		DM17 (Option 1)	A new designated area should be created called "Historic Airport Croydon"	Designation of an area called Historic Airport Croydon.	No change	All representations for proposed local heritage areas put forward during this consultation were reviewed alongside all existing local areas of special character during Summer 2014 against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") for policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). Those areas that meet the criteria will be proposed as new local heritage areas and consulted on in late 2015, accompanied by an evidence base for each proposed local heritage area and reviewed.
0114/01/013/DM17 (Option 1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment		DM17 (Option 1)	Full review of historic significance of Croydon Airport, former Gate House, Roundshaw Open Space and Playing Fields under SP4 Local Character through consultation with Croydon Airport Society.	Full review of historic significance of Croydon Airport, former Gate House, Roundshaw Open Space and Playing fields.	No change	All representations for proposed local heritage areas put forward during this consultation will be reviewed alongside all existing local areas of special character during Summer 2014 against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") for policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). Those areas that meet the criteria will be proposed as new local heritage areas and consulted on in late 2014/early 2015, accompanied by an evidence base for each proposed local heritage area and reviewed.
0114/01/011/DM17 (Option 1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment		DM17 (Option 1)	Airport House, the former Gate House, Roundshaw Open Space and Playing Fields should form part of an application to have the area designated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site as they are of significant National and International Importance.	Airport House, the former Gate House, Roundshaw Open Space and Playing Fields should be designated as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.	No change	Applications for World Heritage Site status should be submitted to UNESCO for determination.

0114/01/002/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Policy is not deliverable in every area, with reference to Airport House and the former Gate House, Purley Way (DM42). DM17 does not show an understanding of the National and International historical significance of the former international airport, WWI RFC and WWII RAF airfield. This would benefit a full review.	Policy should show an understanding on the National and International historical significance of the former international airport, WW1 RFC and WWII RAF airfield.	No change	The historic and architectural significance of Airport House and the former Gate Lodge are reflected in their status as Grade II Listed Buildings.
0114/01/010/DM17 (Option 1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment	DM17 (Option 1)	Airport House and the former Gate House are grade II listed. It would be appropriate to increase the heritage protection to grade II*.	Airport House and former Gate House to be Grade II* listed.	No change	Applications to upgrade the listed status of a building should be submitted to English Heritage for determination.
0114/01/009/DM17 (Option 1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment	DM17 (Option 1)	Roundshaw Playing Field and Roundshaw Open Space to be designated as a Scheduled Monument because it is the site of WWI airfield and aircraft production and site of WWII airfield, RAF and Battle of Britain Airfield.	Roundshaw Playing Field and Roundshaw Open Space to be a Scheduled Monument.	No change	Applications for Scheduling should be submitted to English Heritage for determination.
0114/01/004/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Policy is not deliverable in every area, with reference to Airport House and the former Gate House, Purley Way (DM42). DM17 does not show an understanding of the National and International historical significance of the former international airport, WWI RFC and WWII RAF airfield. This would benefit a full review.	Policy should show an understanding on the National and International historical significance of the former international airport, WW1 RFC and WWII RAF airfield.	No change	The historic and architectural significance of Airport House and the former Gate Lodge are reflected in their status as Grade II Listed Buildings. Policy DM42 recommends that the masterplan will be considered for the area within Waddon's potential new local centre. This will help to increase understanding of the significance of Roundshaw Playing Field and Open Space.
0114/01/008/DM17 (Option 1)/C	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Comment	DM17 (Option 1)	Airport House and the former Airport Gate House, Purley Way to be designated as a Scheduled Monument because the former Gate House is now on the English Heritage "Heritage at Risk" Register ref 1079299 and both buildings are Grade II listed.	Airport House and the former Airport Gate House to be a Scheduled Monument.	No change	Applications for Scheduling should be submitted to English Heritage for determination.
0127/01/008/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Page 88 DM17.2 . We would recommend that this is amended to Applications for development proposals that affect heritage assets and/or their setting must demonstrate..	DM17.2 . Recommend that this is amended to 'Applications for development proposals that affect heritage assets or their setting must demonstrate.'	Change	Add 'and / or their setting' in DM17.2 as recommended.
0127/01/009/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Page 88 DM17.2 c. We would recommend that this is amended to how the integrity and significance of any retained fabric is preserved.	DM17.2 c.Recommend that this is amended to how the integrity and significance of any retained fabric is preserved.	Change	Amend Policy DM17.2 c. and replace 'How the integrity of any retained historic fabric is preserved' with 'How the integrity and significance of any retained fabric is preserved'.

0127/01/006/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Page 88 DM17.1 a and c. We would recommend that special character and appearance and original character is replaced by significance in order to provide greater alignment with the NPPF. Character and appearance is specifically applied to conservation areas and original character may be considered to preclude significant but later additions or alterations.	Amend DM17.1 a and c.so that Special character and appearance and original character is replaced by significance in order to provide greater alignment with the NPPF.	Change	Amend DM17.1 a and c.so that 'Special character and appearance and original character' is replaced by 'significance'
0127/01/007/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Page 88 DM17.1d We would consider it advisable to state that deliberate neglect or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state will not be taken into account in any justification for its loss or harm caused by a proposal. The proposed option of 'may not' potentially diminishes the requirements of National Policy as set out in NPPF Policy 130.	Amend DM17.1d. To state that deliberate neglect or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state will not be taken into account in any justification for its loss or harm caused by a proposal.	Change	Replace 'may not' with 'will not' as recommended (DM17.1.d)
0127/01/010/DM17 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object	DM17 (Option 1)	Page 89 DM17.8. We would recommend that this is amended to All development proposals must preserve and enhance War Memorials and other monuments, and their settings.	DM17.8. Recommend that this is amended to 'All development proposals must preserve and enhance War Memorials and other monuments, and their settings.'	Change	Add 'and their settings' in DM17.8 as recommended.
0130/01/017/DM17 (Option 1)/C	 <i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Comment	DM17 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM17 seeks to replace UDP Policies UC2 to UC14 with respect to heritage assets and conservation. It is intended that draft Policy DM17, when formally adopted, will ensure that Croydon's Local Plan is brought in line with the relevant policy tests relating to the protection, preservation and enhancements of heritage assets and conservation areas as set out in the London Plan and the NPPF.		No change	These comments are noted.

0099/02/016/DM17 (Option 2)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM17 (Option 2)	The CCG supports option 2 (no additional local policies). This would support SO6.	No change	Croydon has a rich and varied heritage that provides depth of character to the borough's environment. The historic environment contributes to local character and distinctiveness and enables an understanding of the pattern of historic development of an area. In order to maintain the borough's character it is vital that heritage assets are protected and sensitively adapted and that their setting is not harmed. The Council recognises the value of the historic environment, especially in relation to the positive contribution it can make to creating and maintaining sustainable communities, and considers it to be important to conserve the valued components of the borough's historic environment for the future. It is considered to be necessary to provide detailed policies in order to do so.	
0003/05/004/Wooded Hillsides (Option 1)/C	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Comment		Wooded Hillsides (Option 1)	London Landscape Framework may support the Council's policies on Wooded Hillside.	Refer to the London Landscape Framework and consider its inclusion within this section of the document.	No change	This section of the document has been deleted and there will not be a policy on Wooded Hillsides in Croydon.
0121/01/017/Wooded Hillsides (Option 2)/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support		Wooded Hillsides (Option 2)	Prefer Option 2	Option 2 to be the preferred policy approach for wooded hillsides policy.	No change	

7 Community Facilities

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0120/01/020//O	ASPRA		Object			However there is a lack of school or significant medical centre within the ASPRA boundary. The western side is being developed into shared accommodation in an unplanned piecemeal scenario, where landlords/freeholders are allowed to make a quick kill on property which is attractive because of the transport infrastructure. Much of the community services are provided by the churches.		No change	The comment is noted. New development in Croydon is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy which supports the provision of new social infrastructure that is required by new development.
0121/01/020/Non-specific/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA		Comment			The Council attention is drawn to a site on Brighton Road(close to Old Lodge Lane) currently a car park. This has the potential to accommodate a new pool and possibly a library.	Consider site for future new pool and library.	No change	Comment noted
0122/02/012/Non-specific/C	Mrs Hilary Chelminski Addiscombe & Shirley Park RA		Comment			Need for more activities and sports in the Addiscombe area, especially for young people.	Provision of more activities and sports in Addiscombe.	No change	Comment noted.

0134/01/001//O	Mr Richard Willmer	Object	<p>I would like to make a strong case for keeping a swimming pool in Purley. The main reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purley has good public transport links and so is best placed in the south of the borough to provide a pool that is easily accessible; 2. the current pool is well used by a wide range of residents, not least because of the ease of access; 3. the pool and gym in Purley give a 'knock on ' effect to local traders as leisure users use those services as well 4. previous reports by Croydon have shown that , even with Purley Pool, the south of the borough has insufficient swimming facilities, so taking away this asset would not be sensible. <p>The current pool needs work on it, but this may well be less costly than building new facilities in Purley or elsewhere. The look of the pool and car park could be improved through use of cladding or other materials. The current pool is younger than the Norwood Pools that were renovated.</p> <p>If there is a need to build a new pool then for the reasons stated above, Purley is an ideal spot in the south of Croydon, existing facilities should be maintained until any new ones are operational.</p> <p>If Croydon wants to maximise its Olympic legacy and provide good quality swimming facilities in the south that are readily accessible, then Purley is the place to keep a pool.</p>	Keep a swimming pool in Purley.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0138/01/001/Non-specific/O	Mr Malcolm Cragg	Object	<p>It would be a major backward step to close Purley pool. The facility is the only place local to Purley to swim. I use it most mornings, and have done for many years. It is such a friendly place and so well used. Please keep it open or build a replacement before you close it.</p>	Keep Purley pool open or build a replacement before it is closed.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0172/01/002//O	Pauline Joyce	Object		<p>As a Purley resident and also a member of Fusion (Purley Pool & Gym) I am writing in support of the facilities remaining in Purley on it's present site or if needs dictate and this site is redeveloped then for the new development to incorporate the facilities in the design.</p> <p>The facilities are always busy and are a benefit to the local community as they provide an easily accessible meeting place where you can keep fit. In these times of being continually advised via all forms of media how important it is to exercise and what a benefit it is to the health service for people of all ages to try their best to maintain a reasonable standard of fitness I think it would be a travesty for Purley to lose this very important facility.</p> <p>I would therefore ask that you register this email in support of keeping the pool and gym open.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0114/01/012/7.007/O	Mr Ian Walker <i>Croydon Airport Society</i>	Object	7.007	<p>Development of the Airport House and the former Gate House would be consistent with the driving principles of "We are Croydon" and recognising the significant heritage of Croydon Airport would provide a solid foundation to support the Local Plan. A large scale heritage development, such as a modern interactive museum facility, would form a strong base to launch Croydon's significant cultural credentials and would satisfy Strategic Objective 2,4,5 and 7.</p>	A large scale heritage development, such as a modern interactive museum facility, should take place.	No change	The policy supports this type of activity.
0118/05/005/7.007/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	7.007	<p>Has had practical experience of seeking to provide evidence in accordance with the provision of principles similar to those set out in paragraph 7.7 and has found that the process has been protracted and uncertain.</p>	A clear strategy as to the Council's expectations for compliance with the above objectives needs to be established to avoid any further confusion as to how to demonstrate that the need and viability of the current community facilities has been concluded and redevelopment is possible.	Change	The wording of the policy and supporting text has been amended to clarify how the policy operates.
0010/05/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Ms Rose Freeman <i>The Theatres Trust</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Support Option 1 but the policy does not reflect strategic objective 2 with regard to the provision of new and improved cultural facilities (theatres, sui-generis and performance spaces in use D2).</p>	Policy should include the word "cultural".	No change	The definition of Community Facilities in the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies DPD includes cultural
0010/05/002/DM18 (Option 1)/C	Ms Rose Freeman <i>The Theatres Trust</i>	Comment	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Inclusion of a description of what is meant by the term community facilities.</p>	Define community facilities on page 97 by using the definition from page 106 of the adopted core strategy.	No change	The Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals are in effect one plan so it is not necessary to repeat the definition in the Detailed Policies and Proposals

0069/02/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Fred Wallis <i>The Save Purley Pool Campaign</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Over the past few years the Save Purley Pool Campaign has made representations to various bodies regarding keeping a swimming pool and gym facility in Purley. It is an essential community facility and is wanted by the majority of the local population. It is well used. Swimming is the best exercise for all ages. The community facility is also needed to keep the town active and alive and is the centre of Purley. Our representation collected over 4000 signatures which was presented to Croydon Council. This received Councillor backing and following this the Pool and Gym were improved and maintained. In order to have a pool and gym in Purley we approached the Secretary of State who recommended that we meet the inspector responsible for signing off the Croydon Plan. We had the meeting with the inspector and put forward that we wanted the facility of the pool and gym in the Plan for Purley. He advised us the best place for us to put forward our recommendations was when the planning department entered into consultation on the Plan for Purley. His comments are on record as is the promise of the Council that a swimming pool and gym will remain in Purley and if at any future date it is desirable for a development of the site to take place that a swimming pool will be built on another site nearby in Purley before the present facility is closed.</p> <p>We are now making a formal request that a Swimming Pool and Gym be entered into the plan for Purley so that the future planners and developers know the request of the local population.</p> <p>The present and future population need this type of community facility which has become the heart of Purley. If Purley is to have a chance of regeneration it will be helped by having this facility at its centre.</p>	Keep Purley Pool, or if the site is redeveloped relocate it nearby ensuring the existing facility remains open until the replacement facility is provided.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	--	--------	-----------------	--	--	--------	--

0069/02/005/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Fred Wallis <i>The Save Purley Pool Campaign</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM18 (Option 1)	We are concerned with DM18.2b as this seems to give the planners a possibility of closing the pool. We believe this point should be removed.	Delete DM18.2b	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	--	--------	--------------------------	-----------------	--	----------------	-----------	--

0084/01/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Dale Greetham <i>Sport England</i>	Object		DM18 (Option 1)	DM18 should ensure it is consistent with and supports NPPF guidance regarding loss of indoor and outdoor sports facilities and should include specific reference to the protection playing fields and the strict exceptions set out in the NPPF and Sport England's adopted Policy.	Sport England's Land Use Policy 3 objectives should be included : 1) to prevent loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport 2) to ensure that the best use is made of existing facilities to maintain greater opportunities for participation 3) to ensure new sport facilities are planned for in a positive and integrated way and opportunities for new facilities are identified to meet current and future demands for sporting participation.	No change	The policy does not repeat the National Planning Policy Framework and there are no specific local considerations that justify a policy. Where the plan is silent Policy SP1 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies states that regard should be had to the National Planning Policy Framework instead.
0084/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/S	Mr Dale Greetham <i>Sport England</i>	Support		DM18 (Option 1)	Welcome the inclusion of this policy.		Welcome support	
0092/01/004/DM18 (Option 1)/O	 <i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM18 (Option 1)	We note that very little reference is made to retaining the existing leisure facilities at Purley Pool and Gym. We note the proposed Clause DM18.2 gives some doubt and that it could be construed that Purley Pool could be closed, without providing additional resources nearby. This would also apply to the multi storey car park attached, which would create huge difficulties if this was to close, particularly as Purley Hospital, has now been refurbished. This car park will probably now be used on a much a larger scale for parking to this hospital.	The car park should not be closed.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0092/01/015/DM18 (Option 1)/O	 <i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM18 (Option 1)	Educational Resources at Riddlesdown Collegiate - although it is not spelt out in the policy documents, the RRA believes that Riddlesdown Collegiate which has 2,000 pupils and 250 staff (and is the largest school within the Borough) has now reached its maximum capacity on this site. The School is also built on MGB land. We believe no new additional classrooms/pupil numbers should be allowed, unless provision is made to improve the footpath, road and bus infra-structure to this school. The Collegiate is situated at the end of a residential cul de sac, and at the beginning and end of each school day, it does create huge implications for residents in terms of increased vehicular and pupil movements for not just the immediate locality but for Riddlesdown in general.	Croydon's policies need to reflect this.	No change	This document does not deal with proposals for specific schools. This comment should be directed to the Council team responsible for the Education Estates Strategy.
0092/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	 <i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM18 (Option 1)	We note that very little reference is made to retaining the existing leisure facilities at Purley Pool and Gym. We note the proposed Clause DM18.2 gives some doubt and that it could be construed that Purley Pool could be closed, without providing additional resources nearby.	We believe this clause should be removed or at least amended. Clause LR3 of the 2006 UDP page 194, does state "Development which would lead to the loss of leisure, indoor sport, arts, cultural and entertainment facilities will not be permitted". We would hope this clause is retained in respect of Purley Pool.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0094/01/005/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ken Whittick	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>In the Planning Inspectors report on Croydon's core strategy, paragraph 65, he said</p> <p>‘The question was raised as to whether it should include specific references to facilities such as Purley Pool. While the Council agreed at the Hearings that Purley Pool should be retained either on its existing site or a nearby site, the Plan is a strategic document and is not the place to deal with individual sites. These will be dealt with through the emerging Croydon Local Plan :Detailed Policies and Proposals.’</p> <p>We believe that the existing community facility of a gym and swimming pool on its existing site, or one close by, should remain available to the people of the borough and should be protected.</p>	Keep Purley pool.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0094/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ken Whittick	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Policy DM18.2b</p> <p>The inclusion of this policy is in direct opposition to policy DM18.1. It immediately removes protection from all of Croydon's communal swimming facilities since all are located on the ground floor within a Main Retail Frontage, a Secondary Retail Frontage, a Shopping Parade or a Restaurant Quarter Parade. This policy must be deleted</p>	Delete this policy DM18.2b	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0094/01/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ken Whittick	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Policy DM18.2c - This policy should be amended as follows:-</p> <p>DM18.2c. Community facilities of equivalent floor space (either on site or co-sited as part of a comprehensive redevelopment) that meets the current or future needs are provided.</p>	This policy should be amended as follows:-	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0097/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Alastair Davis	Object		DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Purley is at the southern end of the borough and to my mind is quite often ignored. What little we do have by way of Pool and Gym is often threatened with closure for no good reason other than the Council views the plot of land on which it and the car park stands as a view to make some money at the expense of residents leaving them with little else than a ghost town. What was once a stylish place in the 70's with many varied shops has been replaced with a Tesco and mainly restaurants and bars. Whilst this is good as a place to visit in the evenings, with family and friends, without a leisure facility it would lose some of it's already limited appeal.</p> <p>At the very least the people of Purley deserve to have a pool and gym facility that is for the benefit of all. I certainly currently use it at least once a week, often twice. I use the pool for exercise and it in my view is one of the best ways for people of all ages to get exercise and to keep active and fit and healthy. The gym is also of benefit though I personally only use the pool, but the choice is there. Should the Council decide in their wisdom that the current facility be closed to make some money I would insist that a new leisure facility should be built in or around the same area before the current facility is closed. It is also a central area to serve the other local areas such as Coulsdon, Kenley, Purley Oaks, and Sanderstead, who would currently use this facility.</p>	Retain Purley Pool or relocate in the same area.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0098/01/004/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Paul Crane	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM18 (Option 1)	Purley Pool should be maintained or an alternative facility built.	Purley Pool should be maintained or an alternative facility built.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0099/02/017/DM18 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden NHS Property Services	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM18 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	Support welcomed

0106/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Jeff Cunliffe	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	I have witnessed the run down of the Purley Town Centre from a thriving township to what is now with the exception of Tesco's, a collection of charity shops, estate agents and fast food places. We have long since stopped using our local town centre and very rarely visit Croydon because of the lack of reasonably priced car parking. Having seen the Croydon Plan I look forward to Purley as a vibrant commuter centre with lively shopping areas pleasant places to eat and spend time with friends and an exciting leisure centre. I am currently a regular user of the swimming facilities in Purley and consider the leisure centre as key to the town's success. I am aware that the policy of retaining it at its present site or one nearby has the support not only of the councillors of Purley and Kenley but also of the leaders of all main parties. It is imperative that this policy is included in the Croydon Plan section 1	Keep Purley pool, or relocate nearby to the existing site. It is imperative that this policy is included in the Croydon Plan section 1.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0106/01/004/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Jeff Cunliffe	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Unfortunately the protection of Community facilities with pools given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b must be deleted	Delete Policy 18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0118/05/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	It is understood and appreciated that the protection of community uses is an important policy objective of the Plan. However the implementation of the policy is the cause of concern.	Address the implementation of this policy.	No change	The policy does not require amendment, but comments on its implementation are noted.
0118/05/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	It is considered that the Council should provide clarity as to the process involved in demonstrating need so that all parties involved in the process have some clarity as to the approach and responsibilities involved.	Further clarity on the process of demonstrating need.	No change	The policy is not the cause for objection rather it's implementation. The Council notes this comment.
0118/05/006/DM18 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	DM18: the preferred policy approach is not deliverable.		Change	The wording of the policy and supporting text has been amended to clarify how the policy operates.
0118/05/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Unclear how current and future needs can accurately be assessed and demonstrated. This requires clarification within the supportive text.	Amend the supportive text to clarify how current and future needs can be accurately assessed and demonstrated.	Change	The wording of the policy and supporting text has been amended to clarify how the policy operates.
0118/05/007/DM18 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	DM18: the preferred approach does not enable sustainable development.		Change	The wording of the policy and supporting text has been amended to clarify how the policy operates.

0120/01/069/DM18 (Option 1)/C	ASPRA	Comment	Soundness - Effective	DM18 (Option 1)	The Old Ashburton Library, Pavilion & Ashburton Park have been a matter of concern, the building having been empty for so long that it has fallen into disrepair. It is generally felt that this would lend itself to becoming a very good cafe/restaurant for the community, perhaps in conjunction with other community groups & projects & also some private or commercial use in the remaining & upper spaces.	Consider use as cafe/restaurant for the community, perhaps in conjunction with other community groups & projects & also some private or commercial use in the remaining & upper spaces.	No change	The use of the former Ashburton Library is being considered by the Council's Assets team
0121/01/019/DM18 (Option 1)/S	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Support		DM18 (Option 1)	Agree with Option 1. Local community in Purley is fairly unanimous in retaining the Purley Pool, or provide new in any redevelopment. It is a well used facility and also raises a lot of money every year for charities(Swimathon).		Welcome support	
0121/01/021/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Object		DM18 (Option 1)	For Policy DM18 2 b. add ` subject to equivalent or improved facilities having already been provided nearby.`	Policy DM18 2 b. add ` subject to equivalent or improved facilities having already been provided nearby.`	Change	Purley Leisure Centre will be removed from the Main Retail Frontage to ensure it is not inadvertently left unprotected as a community use by this policy.
0130/01/019/DM18 (Option 1)/S	The Croydon Partnership	Support		DM18 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM18.3 sets out the criteria that an applicant should meet when pursuing an application for a new community use. Specifically, draft Policy DM18.3 states that the Council will support applications for community uses where they include buildings which are flexible, adaptable, capable of multi-use and enable future expansion; are accessible to local shopping facilities, healthcare and public transport; and have regard to the cumulative effect of similar uses within the area, the impact on street scene, traffic generation and parking provision. We support the Council's Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') for draft Policy DM18.3, in particular the requirement for applications for community use to include buildings which are flexible, adaptable, capable of multi-use and which enable future expansion. We feel this will bring the Croydon Local Plan in line with the adopted Croydon OAPF.		Welcome support	

0130/01/018/DM18 (Option 1)/O	The Croydon Partnership	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM18 seeks to ensure that community facilities are protected within the Borough and are provided in a flexible format in sustainable locations within development proposals coming forward. Draft Policy DM18.2 sets out three criteria which must be met if a proposed loss of an existing community facility is to be acceptable. Whilst we agree with the criteria as set out in Option 1 of draft Policy DM18.2, we would ask that the policy, if adopted, is supported by suitable text which sets out how an applicant is able to demonstrate that there is no longer a need for the existing premises or land for community use (in relation to Criterion A and C); this will give applicants a greater steer and provide them with suitable guidance when considering a development proposal that results in a change of use from a community facility.	The policy, if adopted, should be supported by suitable text which sets out how an applicant is able to demonstrate that there is no longer a need for the existing premises or land for community use (in relation to Criterion A and C)	Change	The wording of the policy and supporting text has been amended to clarify how the policy operates.
0131/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Huseyin Dinc	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	I would like you to do something about Purley Pool. No to closed pool. We would like the pool kept open.	Purley pool should be kept open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0132/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Laura Partridge	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>The pool at Purley is a fantastic facility that is used by young and old alike and for many, including myself, is an essential part of a healthy lifestyle. I live in Coulsdon and Purley is my closest public swimming pool. It is very conveniently located near to the train station in the centre of Purley, meaning that I can easily incorporate a visit to the pool into my morning commute to London where I work. I use the pool at least one or twice a week and rely on it heavily for exercise during the winter months when running outside, my usual form of exercise, becomes increasingly difficult and even dangerous owing to the lack of daylight hours.</p> <p>Purley leisure centre offers a very reasonably priced and flexible facility for those of us that do not wish to join a corporate gym and I meet friendly many regulars whenever and am always impressed by the amount that they visit the pool, indeed many visit nearly every morning. It's location makes it ideal for commuters such as myself and those that need to rely in public transport for travelling.</p> <p>I would therefore ask that the Council's plans retain Purley leisure centre and the pool in its present site.</p>	Purley pool should be kept open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0132/01/002/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Laura Partridge

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

The pool at Purley is a fantastic facility that is used by young and old alike and for many, including myself, is an essential part of a healthy lifestyle. I live in Coulsdon and Purley is my closest public swimming pool. It is very conveniently located near to the train station in the centre of Purley, meaning that I can easily incorporate a visit to the pool into my morning commute to London where I work. I use the pool at least one or twice a week and rely on it heavily for exercise during the winter months when running outside, my usual form of exercise, becomes increasingly difficult and even dangerous owing to the lack of daylight hours.

Purley leisure centre offers a very reasonably priced and flexible facility for those of us that do not wish to join a corporate gym and I meet friendly many regulars whenever and am always impressed by the amount that they visit the pool, indeed many visit nearly every morning. It's location makes it ideal for commuters such as myself and those that need to rely in public transport for travelling.

I would therefore ask that the Council's plans retain Purley leisure centre and the pool in its present site. If however, there is a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped; a swimming pool and gym must be built on the same site or nearby prior to the closure of the present facility.

If there is a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped; a swimming pool and gym must be built on the same site or nearby prior to the closure of the present facility.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0133/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Margaret Clinch

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I gather that under the Croydon Local Plan the continued existence of Purley Swimming Pool (and Gym) and the multi-storey car park are all under threat. I am writing to ask you to please ensure the continuing presence of these much-used facilities IN THE CENTRE OF PURLEY. Our swimming pool is a 'constant' and focal point in the town and the mere idea of it 'disappearing' is just too much to contemplate.

Purley pool should be kept.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

Over 40 years ago, we had a town (free) car park. The car park land was taken over by Sainburys, who there erected a smallish store (long closed) and as a quid pro quo built our swimming pool and multi-storey car park adjoining their store. I believe that at that time there was a public swimming pool somewhere along the Purley Way, but there was pressure from local people to have a swimming pool right in the centre of Purley, with its excellent bus links. So pressure from local people brought us our much-loved pool: and the need for it being there is even more pressing today with the general ageing of our population, as so many of us do not drive cars any more. We need a pool RIGHT IN THE TOWN CENTRE, where it is at the moment!

It is a very popular facility, and the mere THOUGHT of its being under threat fills me with incredulity. The pool is well used and extremely easy to get to, either on foot or by bus (I walk down the hill to the pool, but take the 412 back up the hill after my swim). I know the Council has recently opened another pool somewhere in the Waddon area, and maybe there are thoughts that this could replace the Purley facility. But that is no use to somebody like me who does not drive and who lives on the EASTERN side of the town..... Without getting several buses there is no way that I could get to the Waddon pool, and I do not know of any other pool, apart from our Purley pool, within reasonable distance from my house. The mere THOUGHT of going anywhere along the Purley way first thing in the morning would fill any sensible person with horror - even if they could get there!

So PLEASE re-consider any thoughts you have of doing away with the Purley swimming pool and gym. Remember that we lost a perfectly good and free car park in return for a much-needed (then as now) swimming pool and gym. Leisure facilities are precious assets and exercise is acknowledged as a very important way for people to remain

healthy. Regular swimming must keep a lot of elderly people fit and not reliant on the Council social services.....

0133/01/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Margaret Clinch	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	The pool has recently had a greatly-appreciated smartening-up. Compared with many swimming pools around the country, this particular pool is not very old. But if modern requirements consider our pool in need of replacement, I think you owe it to Purley residents to ensure that any rebuilding of that particular site MUST include a swimming pool and gym. The pool is near to some excellent bars and 'eateries' and is perfectly positioned. It is something of a focal point in the town and you would be letting down local residents if you did not continue to provide these facilities ON OR NEARBY THE PRESENT SITE.	Ensure that any rebuilding of that particular site where the Purley pool is currently MUST include a swimming pool and gym or the facilities must be provided nearby the site.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0135/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Brian Playford	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	We use the pool at least once a week. I have a swimming lesson and have done so for a few years. It keeps me fit, I am seventy nine year old and look forward to going to the pool. My wife also swims. I also am a member of the gym. We like sometimes to have lunch after a swim. Vast amount of money has been spent on Purley high street with new pavements and sign post etc. We need a reason to come to Purley high streets, so please do not take our pool away we need it now.	Keep Purley pool in Purley.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0136/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mr Gavin Mallion

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

As a Council tax payer for 20 years and a user of Purley Pool for even longer, I just have to express my feelings to you at this time of making plans for the future. We desperately need your help again to Save Purley Pool, not close it down for another new development of flats.

Keep Purely Pool open.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

This great asset to the community is used by me regularly. I prefer to go before work and its EARLY OPENING hours have been a LIFE LINE to me after a back operation which has left me slightly disabled with nerve damage. I am 48 years old and the friendly staff and the great facility (albeit rather dilapidated) helped me through this difficult time and MUST BE KEPT OPEN. This little centre is vital to so many people of all ages as well as schools and young people who need encouraging to take sport seriously.
WHY KEEP THIS PUBLIC SERVICE OPEN- AND IN THIS LOCATION?
Childhood obesity can be avoided / kids have a place to go to
Adult stroke avoidance / keeps NHS bills down
Mental and physical wellbeing / keeps us healthy and productive and ultimately keeps costs of healthcare down
Sense of community is created with a sports centre in an area with a rapidly rising population
Employment for the local community is created.
Visitors are attracted to Purley who then spend money in local shops.
Local Office workers can exercise before , during and after work -
That's me!!

IF POOR COUNTIES AND POORER BOROUGHES CAN KEEP FACILITIES OPEN - SO CAN WE.

Please take local people's views into account - our voices matter!!

0137/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Kate Richards	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I understand that the future of Purley pool is again under discussion.</p> <p>I have lived at the Purley end of South Croydon for 20 years and cannot overstate how important the pool and complex is to me, my family and the local community. It fulfils so many needs and also must help support already vulnerable local business in the town.</p> <p>I use the pool at least weekly and as a consequence also shop in Purley. I see so many people of all ages use the pool - it would be a tragedy to lose this local amenity especially for the young people who use it. There are so many negative pressures on our youth that I feel very strongly it is important to encourage those who want to make good habits early in life.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0138/02/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Malcolm Cragg	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I use Purley Pool every day, it has been a lifeline, bad back, stiff neck, no longer. All through regular swimming. Us oldies queue up each morin to get our fix. Don,t close it done, it,s a local jewel for us. Waddon's fine and dandy, but it's a long way from most of ups. It must save numerous hospital visits and prescription drugs. Go on keep it open,</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0139/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mandi Harris	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I have concerns over the recent news that Purley pool may be closing. This subject is particularly close to me as my son, aged 14, is currently training as a Regional Swimmer. I cannot express how important this local pool is for our local swimmers and young children. It has been a very valuable local facility to us over the years whilst we have swam & trained, been to the gym or attended for school swimming galas.</p> <p>There is a lack of public swimming pools in the Croydon area. In fact the lack of facilities shows in local schools, the number of children who can swim at my sons school out of a class of 30 is 2. I feel swimming is a necessity for children not just a hobby.</p> <p>Following the Olympics a large amount of children expressed an interest in swimming and in sports/keep fit in general, without the facilities we are letting them down. We always hear stories of how children sit around on computers but without the local facilities, what are they to do, where do they go to keep fit? Where do they learn to swim? Purley is easy to get to with plenty of facilities and shopping in the local area.</p> <p>My sons swimming club also train at Purley so without this pool they are going to struggle to keep up sessions for all these members.</p> <p>I feel Purley pool does need to remain open.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0140/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Jeremy Thompson	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing to you because I believe a swimming pool and leisure facility should remain in Purley. It is a vital resource for the area. As a family we use the facility on a regular basis. My children take swimming lessons there and my wife and I use the pool regularly. It is always well used and provides an important social meeting point as well as providing opportunities for exercise and the accompanying health benefits. The facility is easy to get to both by car and by public transport from a wide area. It enhances the town and draws people to the local shops and businesses. Any plans to redevelop the site should certainly make provision for a pool and gym as their loss would be to the detriment of the town</p>	Keep Purley pool open, or make provision for a pool and gym in Purley	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0141/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr George Leptos	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am appalled that the survival of Purley Pool is in question again following a significant petition a couple of years ago. I am a frequent user of Purley swimming pool since it is easy to get to, and I see that it is well used. It is needed for the health of the public and provides a place for the young and old to exercise. Purley is a lively area with shopping facilities and a variety of pleasant places to eat and spend time with friends and the leisure facility enhances the experience of going to Purley. Whilst Waddon is nothing but a road crossroad with no other shops restaurants or parking and is highly inconvenient.</p>	<p>Keep Purley pool open,should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped; a swimming pool and gym must be built on the same site or nearby prior to the closure of the present facility.</p>	Change	<p>The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences</p>
				<p>What I wish is for the plan to say that the swimming pool and gym should remain in Purley on its present site and if there should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped; a swimming pool and gym must be built on the same site or nearby prior to the closure of the present facility. What else is there to do in Purley since it is bad enough that the Cinema has gone and same with the bowling alley?</p>			
				<p>All we Purley and Kenley residents seem to be are a cash cow to pay higher council tax to Croydon council due to the bigger and privately owned houses in the area whilst we are constantly threatened with reduced facilities and undesirable housing developments.</p>			
0142/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Denise Stuart	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing in support of Purley pool and the desperate need to keep it open. In this era of post Olympic legacy I am totally dismayed that any sporting facilities are considered for closure. As head coach of a local swimming club, I am acutely aware of the need for training pool time. Closing Purley pool would be a travesty and another nail in the coffin of public leisure and the vital need to encourage, involve and nurture sporting activities for all.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	<p>The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences</p>

0143/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Alison Trundell	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I was surprised to learn that there are still plans to close the Purley Pool. This both shocks and saddens me. There is no other community leisure centre in Purley and we as residents lack facilities. I can remember when Purley was a vibrant town centre but today there is nothing much there to amuse residents, let alone the younger generation. Much is talked about the population as a whole not taking enough exercise, with children in general not participating in sports. There also appears to be great national concern that a large number of children are unable to swim but here we are facing closure of this basic facility.</p> <p>I appreciate that there is a new sports centre in Waddon but why should we have to travel there by car and sit in dense traffic at weekends, especially when Purley pool is within walking distance of home for most residents. There seems no sense in this at all.</p> <p>I feel that the leisure centre is important to the town as a whole and understand that the policy of retaining it at its present site or one nearby has the support not only of the councillors of Purley and Kenley but also of the leaders of all main parties.</p> <p>I believe that it makes no difference that the present site of the pool is not located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. When the pool was built this was the case and had it not been for the short sighted view to allow the huge development of Tesco in the town centre no doubt Sainsburys would have kept their retail outlet open, but that is another story. In spite of this the pool is within easy access of the town centre site. Thus the protection of Community facilities with pools given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b must be deleted.</p>	Keep Purley pool.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	-----------------	--------	-----------------	--	-------------------	--------	--

0143/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Alison Trundell	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	The protection of Community facilities with pools given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b must be deleted.	Policy DM18.2b must be deleted.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	-----------------	--------	-----------------	--	---------------------------------	--------	--

0144/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Viv Edwards	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I want to express my strongly felt views that, as a regular visitor to Purley Pool, that a swimming pool in Purley is an essential part of the plan. I use it often, I find it easy to get to and to park and it is a wonderful facility, which keeps me fit and healthy. There can be no doubt in my mind that this facility must continue.</p> <p>If the plan requires it to be closed or redeveloped, then please please ensure that an equivalent, or better, pool be available for use prior to any development of the existing pool commencing.</p>	Keep Purley pool open, or ensure that an equivalent, or better, pool be available for use prior to any development of the existing pool commencing.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0145/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bill Tubb	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I would like to confirm to those involved with the above that Purley wants to maintain its Swimming Pool and Gym facilities which are used by a large number regularly including myself and neighbours . It is good for our health. Our Scouts and Guides from St Barnabas also use it.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0147/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mrs Helga Carter	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing to you to request to keep and maintain our Swimming Pool in Purley town centre.</p> <p>As a registered disabled person I am so very grateful to be able to swim there four times every week, as this is the only kind of sport my body allows me to do.</p> <p>From personal experience, I can confirm that the pool is well used from 7 a.m. till late by all members of the community, ranging from over 80 year olds to very young babies. It is a vital facility for the health of the people of South Croydon, Purley, Coulsdon, Kenley, Sanderstead and more.</p> <p>Our Leisure Centre is ideally situated, on many bus routes and with excellent car parking facilities in the multi-storey car park, near a variety of shops and pleasant places to eat and meet friends.</p> <p>The Swimming Pool and Gym are, without doubt, a draw for people to visit Purley and this, in turn, generates revenue for our other local businesses.</p> <p>I urge you to include in your Croydon Plan provisions for our swimming pool and gym to remain on its present site or should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a new swimming pool and gym be built very close by prior to the closure of the present facility.</p>	Keep Purley pool open or provisions for our swimming pool and gym to remain on its present site or should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a new swimming pool and gym be built very close by prior to the closure of the present facility.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0148/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Dennis Hill	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am anxious that the Purley Swimming Pool and Gym be retained. I was one of many thousands who signed a petition a year or two ago. For most people in the south of the Borough, it is easy to get to by train and bus, and even on foot. I have regularly used this Leisure Centr for 20 years. The facility is well used, particularly by some from outside the Borough, such as from the Caterham valley, Wallington and Coulsdon.</p> <p>The claim of the government at the time of the Olympics was that it would encourage more people to take part in sport, which is essential for the health of the public, young and old. What message does it give that, in respose, the Croydon Borough promptly closes down such an important and existing well-used facility. The pool at Waddon is fine but, due to the heavy traffic in and around that area, it does not cater well for those who live in the south of the Borough. Fewer buses serve the Waddon Leisure Centre than the many that serve Purley from all directions.</p> <p>Any Plan for Purley should retain The Purley Leisure Centre on the present site. If there is any really justified reason for the site to be redeveloped for another purpose, I would expect the Council to build a similar facility close to the present site.</p>	Keep Purley pool. Any Plan for Purley should retain The Purley Leisure Centre on the present site. If there is any really justified reason for the site to be redeveloped for another purpose, I would expect the Council to build a similar facility close to the present site.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0149/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Hannah Brindle	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing to express my concerns that Purley swimming pool will be shut down. I have regularly used the pool and leisure facilities and see it as an essential part of the community of Purley. We live in walking distance from the pool and don't have another local facility that provides the same benefits.</p> <p>My children have had swimming lessons there and we have enjoyed swimming there as a family. If anything it needs rejuvenating and not destroying. I urge you to consider the needs of the people living in the local community who need this facility. An enhanced leisure centre will bring much to the community of Purley both in the short and long term.</p>	Keep Purley pool open- it needs rejuvenating rather than destroying.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0150/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Grant Georgiades

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

Please note my total objection to any potential closure of Purley Swimming Pool & Gym. As an employer of over 50 staff in close proximity to Purley Hg St the lack of amenities it offers is already a stumbling block to recruiting high calibre staff. Should the high street deteriorate even further I believe that as a company we may have no other option but to relocate. We are passionate about health and fitness and established a corporate account to encourage our employees to join the centre as part of a health and fitness program.

Please note my total objection to any potential closure of Purley Swimming Pool & Gym. As an employer of over 50 staff in close proximity to Purley Hg St the lack of amenities it offers is already a stumbling block to recruiting high calibre staff. Should the high street deteriorate even further I believe that as a company we may have no other option but to relocate. We are passionate about health and fitness and established a corporate account to encourage our employees to join the centre as part of a health and fitness program.

I'm aware that the dire state of the high street is a direct result of Tesco opening their super centre some years ago a decision that is irreversible. Other poor town planning decisions, such as allowing a block of flats to be built on the site of the old Odean Cinema have also contributed significantly to its decline and have left very little to attract people to the high street. There are few things little that Tesco can't offer that the high street can, the health centre is one of them. If we are to have any hope of regenerating the high street a gym/swimming pool should be central to the over arching plan. How much will our shops and eateries suffer if it is closed? I site Forrest Hill Pools as an example of the type of facility we should be looking to create for our residents and the fantastic lift it has given to the surrounding shops.

Not to mention the incredible health benefits and opportunities to engage socially that a facility of this nature offers local residents. In an age of an obesity crisis we should be looking to invest and increase the number of sports and recreational facilities in our area not close one of them. As a regular attendee to both the pool and gym both always seem incredibly well used. I find it scandalous that a facility that is being supported by its community should even be being considered for closure. Unless a pool and gym is integral to any plan to

Keep Purley pool open. Closure will have adverse impacts on the high street and the town.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

				redevelop the site I will be a vehement oppose of them.			
0151/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Louis Kirkham	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am very surprised to hear about the possibility of Purley Leisure Centre closing. I have used the swimming pool at the leisure centre 3-4 times a week for the past 3 years during my lunch break at work and see swimming as a huge part of my work day; as a stress relief, relaxation aid and somewhere outside of work to go for a 30-60 minute break.</p> <p>Having some form of exercise is important to me as I face 8 hours sitting down a day so the leisure centre is vital to keep active and have a shower.</p> <p>I am actually amazed that there is even consideration about this closure. The swimming pool is busy daily with child swimming lessons and aquafit classes amongst others and during the school holidays it can be difficult to find space to swim such is the number of users. The gym also looks busy at all the times I visit so the number of people a closure would affect is vast.</p> <p>I dearly hope that the pool won't close or that alternative leisure facilities will be provided within Purley town centre as swimming has become an important part of my life that I would hate to lose.</p>	Keep Purley pool open, or provide alternative leisure facilities within Purley town centre.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0152/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr John Ritchie	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing to support the Purley Swimming pool and gym. I strongly believe that it's part of the focal point of Purley and significantly supports visitors to the area and therefore the local economy. My family and I, and a number of friends use the facilities regularly as part of our aim to maintain fitness and health. I believe it is well used and an essential part of our community and would urge that it be maintained and remain a positive feature of the local area for many years to come.</p>	Keep Purley pool open and retain in Purley.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0153/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mrs Liz Marsden

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I am writing to let you know as a Croydon Resident, how important the swimming pool in Purley is and I and my family regularly use the pool, including swimming lessons there. There is the Rotary Swimathon at the pool every February which raises thousands of pounds for local charities.

Keep Purley pool open.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

I am particularly environmentally conscious, so it is important for me that I can get to the pool without use of my car. The bus takes my family and I there easily and we can also walk to the pool.

Off the top of my head, I can think of at least two families who attend swimming lessons there, who cannot drive and walk to the pool. The lessons are also affordable compared to some other private pools, many of which are on the Purley Way, which is not easily accessible unless you have a car.

Purley Pool is a two minute walk from a mainline train station, on at least 10 different bus routes and at the axis of major roads leading to population centres in four different directions. In short it is an extremely accessible place. I have not visited the new pool in Waddon, as it would take at least 2 bus journeys, and is on the Purley Way, which is a traffic quagmire. My children would be exhausted before they had even got there.

Purley Pool also provides free children's swimming during the holidays, providing a much needed outlet for exercise and entertainment for local children. Having something to do cheaply and locally helps avoid some of the problems of youth hanging around with nothing to do. Not to mention the benefits of exercise, when we are consistently being warned the NHS is facing a crisis with an obesity epidemic on the horizon.

The pool also is used very heavily by local schools, some of whom travel there by bus. Where are these children supposed to go to learn how to swim?

In short, it would be extremely short-sighted and short termist to remove this vital service from Purley's town centre. The centre is extremely well used despite not being in the best state of repair. A prudent option for the long term would be to convert it into a swimming and sports centre, which may well help to alleviate anti-social behaviour in the area caused by boredom and would vastly reduce NHS costs through regular exercise

preventing ill health, particularly in older people (of which there are many in the area).

I urge you to please protect Purley's swimming pool.

0154/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr David Brown	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I have been resident in Croydon for 55 years. I think it is important to retain local sports and leisure facilities within our neighborhoods. I believe Purley Town Centre could be a thriving local centre were the Council to make a long term commitment to protecting the few services and facilities such as the swimming pool that remain. Including this in the plan would provide a framework within which commerce and perhaps social enterprises can also plan and bring in investment. The key is to make it a place where people, young and old, want to spend time and spend money. Please, make a clear commitment to that end within the local plan.</p>	<p>Keep Purley pool open and retain ithe leisure facility within Purley Town Centre. And incorporate this commitment into the Local Plan.</p>	Change	<p>The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences</p>
0155/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Sally Rodwell	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing in regard to Purley Leisure centre. I understand that the site may be closed and re-developed. I just wanted to say that unless the site is being re-developed as a new leisure centre, I think this would be a terrible mistake.</p> <p>I have lived in Purley for 30 years and have noted the steady decline of the leisure facilities and surrounding area of Purley. I would love to see Purley become an exciting hub of commerce with a vibrant community centre and a place that I can be proud to live in. I believe a modern and commercially viable leisure centre is something that could be at the heart of that. I have used Purley pool all of my life and find the staff there to be incredibly helpful and warm. The location is perfect and I know a lot of people who travel by public transport or walk to use the gym or pool. An alternative location would not be suitable for myself or others.</p> <p>Having looked at the Croydon Local Plan I would also like to point out that he protection of Community facilities given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b must be deleted.</p> <p>I would like to raise my objection to the plans for Purley Leisure Centre.</p>	<p>Keep Purely pool open , or redvelop as a new leisure centre in the same location.</p>	Change	<p>The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences</p>

0155/01/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Sally Rodwell	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Having looked at the Croydon Local Plan I would also like to point out that the protection of Community facilities given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b must be deleted.	Policy DM18.2b must be deleted.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	---------------	--------	-----------------	---	---------------------------------	--------	--

0156/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Tricia Underwood	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Within the Plan for Purley, the Purley Pool and Gym MUST REMAIN.</p> <p>I have lived in 3 areas of Croydon over the last 33 years and have regularly used the swimming pool, and have made friends with a variety of people using the Pool and Gym, local residents of all ages who use it to improve their health with healthy exercise and swimming exercise which is the best. This pool/gym is used by Selsdon, South Croydon, Croydon, Sanderstead, Warlingham, HamseyGreen, Purley, Kenley, Whytleaf, and Coulsdon, residents and more covering a very large area including several schools.</p> <p>The excellent position suits for shopping, places to eat, and generally socialize with friends from all directions because it is easy to get too, the car park is vital with the station across the road, the health centre and Purley hospital within a short walk, in fact a good central position. The building appears in sound structure and with a little revamping and upgrade it would enhance the facility without an enormous expense to the public purse - that's you and me.</p> <p>It can take many months to build a suitable replacement and the health and social decline to the area and people would be catastrophic. Such a replacement would need to be similarly central and built before the existing pool is demolished.</p> <p>This Pool and Gym facility is needed by the local people and some not so local who have no alternative Pool & gym near by. Add my vote to keep the Pool.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	------------------	--------	-----------------	--	------------------------	--------	--

0157/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Jean Neville	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	This facility is one of the few we have in Purley. It is well used, wonderfully situated near the station (Commuters can use before and after work) and the bus routes with parking right on top of it! If the old pool is to be demolished and the site sold on a new pool and gym MUST be built in the same vicinity prior to the closure of this one. So many older people use the pool, along with the gym members and school children it is a very sociable place. Also with High Street and its amenities so close by it is a perfect site to accommodate the less mobile of our community.	Keep Purley pool open, or if the site is redeveloped, a new pool and gym must be provided in the same vicinity prior to the closure of the existing facility.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0158/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Mark Windsor	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am writing to tell you that I use the swimming pool at Purley on the way to work during the week and for me its very easy to get to on the way to the station at Purley. I use it regularly and see that it is well used. It clearly fulfils a need for the health of the public and provides a place for the young and old to exercise, so contributing to the well being of us all in this area. Purley is a lively area with shopping facilities and a variety of pleasant places to eat and spend time with friends; our local leisure facility enhances the experience of going to Purley.</p> <p>I am asking you to ensure that the plan for Purley includes provision for the swimming pool and gym remaining on its present site and if there is a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a swimming pool and gym must be built in Purley on the same site or nearby, prior to the closure of the present facility.</p> <p>I do hope this is helpful and helps to ensure we can enjoy a swimming pool and gym for public use in Purley long into the future.</p>	Ensure that the plan for Purley includes provision for the swimming pool and gym remaining on its present site and if there is a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a swimming pool and gym must be built in Purley on the same site or nearby, prior to the closure of the present facility.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0159/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mr Tony Farrell
Rotary Club of Croydon

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

Other than the many locals who have already signed a petition, in previous years, against loss of this facility, I wish to bring to you another aspect that some might have overlooked.

Keep Purley pool open.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

The Rotary Club of Purley plans and organises the local annual Purley Charity Swimathon that regularly raises over £24k per year and has, since it's conception, raised almost £400k. This money finds its way to many local and national charities. It also supports other local causes such as the Purley Youth Project. This main fundraising relies on Purley Pool being available for two days in February for the Swimathon itself albeit most of the 48 teams (up to 480 swimmers) taking part, enjoy the facility of Purley Pool throughout the year.

To lose the use of the pool would be a massive blow to the many who see the annual Purley Swimathon as the main, if not the only source of raising much needed funds. This includes Purley Rotary who's own main source of revenue, for giving, is derived from this event.

Beyond the immediate loss of a major source of fundraising is that the medium to long term loss will impact heavily on Purley Rotary's ability to continue to give support to local community projects and indeed other national and global causes.

I therefore feel strongly that the Purley Pool should stay within the community in order to deliver a much needed facility that fulfils much more than a daily swim for some.

I do hope my concerns are taken into account when the final decision on Purley Pool and Gym is taken.

0160/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mr Donald Ratledge

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I understand that there may be a question mark about the future of the swimming pool and gym in Purley High Street.
I cannot understand why this should be so, since it seems to me to be self-evident that a facility of this kind should be maintained. I use it regularly and every time I do so it appears to be very well supported.

Keep Purley pool.

No change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

Unlike the new Waddon facility, this one is in the heart of Purley and is an integral part of the town, with easy access from every part of Purley and the surrounds with a large car park adjacent to it. Waddon has more limited public transport and parking facilities.

When this area of Purley was redeveloped it was Croydon Council who made the case, as part of the associated planning applications, that the facility would be an important feature of the town's facilities and should be strongly supported. Those arguments are as pertinent today as they were then. They have not in any way been diminished by the opening of the Waddon facility. It is self evident that Waddon is not a part of Purley, it is part of Croydon. Coulsdon, Riddlesdown, Sanderstead, Kenley, Woodcote and other local areas all look to Purley Pool as their local facility. In no sense could Waddon substitute for that.

0161/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Denise Bray	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I have lived in Purley for 30 years and I swim at Purley Pool 3 - 4 days a week early morning. I use Purley because it is convenient and easy to get to by foot. I would not like to have to drive further afield to use another pool. Every day that I swim I see that the pool is well used by local people who swim to maintain a healthy lifestyle and the gym facility supports this. After swimming it is a pleasure to join friends for coffee in one of the many cafes in Purley before doing my shopping. To summarise, I feel that Purley Pool enhances the experience of being in Purley and for me it means I can exercise, socialise and shop in one area without having to travel an inconvenient distance to another leisure facility.</p> <p>I understand that the pool needs to be modernised and indeed the surrounding buildings need to be redeveloped but I feel that the plan should be to ensure a pool and leisure centre is kept in Purley and if the present site needs to close then the same facilities should be re built close by the present site. It seems unbelievable that the government is trying to encourage we maintain a healthy lifestyle and yet the council is trying to shut down health and leisure facilities. I urge the council to reconsider their proposals.</p>	The plan should be to ensure a pool and leisure centre is kept in Purley and if the present site needs to close then the same facilities should be re built close by the present site.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0162/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Roger Chapman	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Purley pool should be kept open. Swimming is one of the best forms of exercise. Please do not deprive me and others of this, the best way to keep fit.	Purley pool should be kept open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0162/02/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Roger Chapman	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Purley pool should be kept open. Swimming is a great form of exercise and should be encouraged.	Purley pool should be kept open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0163/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Gillian Turner

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

The Purley pool and gym bove is well attended by the residents of Purley and surrounding arears every early morning, I being one. I go each morning to the Gym and swimming pool I have managed to keep fit hence I have not had to put any pressure on the nation's Health Service which at present seems to be struggling with the current demand.

Keep Purley pool open.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

It is a well known fact that exercise is good for ones health, at present I can walk to the Purley Gym and Swimming Pool, however should it close I will be unable to walk to Waddon which will be my nearest Pool/Gym hence my general health my suffer consequently there will be one an extra drain on the National Health service.

In conclusion there a considerable amount of people who use the Purley facility for numerous health reasons not only to keep fit, hence the closure could cost more in Health related matters than the cost of keeping the facility open.

0164/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Dug Conn

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

The swimming pool and gym at Purley should remain, or necessarily be replaced in Purley with a very similar facility, ideally being built first before closing the current facility as council money is tight and a replacement pool may never get built. It is a great leisure and health benefit for those who have access to it.

There are access issues with the new pool at Waddon. People living to the east, south east and south of Croydon do not find Waddon accessible.

Purley has some of the best public transport access facilities. Many buses travel along the all four major roads which meet at Purley Cross. The railway station at Purley is a fast link into London as well as southwards and passengers are able to use the pool and gym either before going to work or on their return. The parking in Purley isn't too bad either for those who have to use personal transport.

People who exercise are usually healthier than those who don't and that has to be a benefit to the council's expenditure.

Having now had Purley street enhancement to make it more attractive for shoppers, the pool does encourage its users to also use the local shops.

I have used Purley Pool for many years now, almost all weekday early mornings, because of its easy access on buses and the level walk along the Brighton Road. While in Purley, having swum, I have used many of the local shops and Tesco (without having to use my car).

I am in the fortunate position of being able to use Waddon leisure centre as it is marginally nearer to my home, and I can catch the bus from South End just like when I used Purley, but there is no shopping centre near the complex and apart from Morrison's will remain so. I have found that when I have reused Purley pool that it is still or even more busier than when I was a regular user whilst Waddon pool remains a low use pool, fortunately for us users, particularly when half the pool is being used by a swimming club.

When Purley pool has been closed, recently, very few of its regular users came to Waddon, maybe preferring to go to Caterham or New Addington than the extra drive along the Purley Way or plainly didn't have the time to

Keep Purley pool open.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

travel there.

0165/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Gary Vardell	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I live in Coulsdon but am a regular user of the Purley Pool. I find it easy to get to using public transport and have found it very beneficial for the local community, also providing a local place for the young and old to exercise without having to make unnecessary journeys to Waddon. Whilst Purley has its ongoing problems it remains a lively area with improving shopping facilities and an increasing variety of pleasant places to eat where locals can socialise. I find that the leisure facility definitely enhances the experience of going to Purley.</p>	<p>Keep Purley pool and gym on their present site and if there should be a justified reason for the site to be further redeveloped; a swimming pool and gym must be built in Purley on the same site or nearby, prior to the closure of the present facility.</p>	Change	<p>The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences</p>
				<p>I think it is vital that the Plan for Purley should retain the swimming pool and gym on their present site and if there should be a justified reason for the site to be further redeveloped; a swimming pool and gym must be built in Purley on the same site or nearby, prior to the closure of the present facility.</p>			

0166/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Caroline Hughes

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I am particularly interested in saving the swimming pool and gym facilities in Purley.

I have been swimming three or four times a week at Purley Pool for the last 20 odd years and have written (and signed petitions) to Croydon Council in the past about the importance of keeping this facility open in the heart of Purley.

Purley has very little to offer its residents in the way of amenities. It has a large Tesco, estate agents, charity shops and takeaway/restaurants, so a leisure facility is definitely needed - especially one that is affordable to all.

Purley Pool is a great place to meet people. I've made many friends there who I've known for years. It is also a great way for young and old alike to keep fit. I do not use the gym but see it is well used, as is the pool - by individuals and by schools and swimming clubs. It is in a central location which means it is accessible by train, bus, car, foot.

I therefore think it is vital to keep the pool and gym on its current site or if this is not possible, then it should be relocated nearby and remain in Purley. Moreover the present pool and gym should not be closed until an alternative has been provided.

I hope you will bear these comments in mind when considering the future of Purley.

Keep Purley pool, or if this is not possible, then it should be relocated nearby and remain in Purley. Moreover the present pool and gym should not be closed until an alternative has been provided. Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0167/01/010/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Lisa Behan	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Support of our local swimming pool and gymnasium.</p> <p>Purley has changed greatly in the last few years and unfortunately not for the better. The one community facility that successfully enables local citizens to interact bringing positivity, vibrancy and 'community' to Purley is the pool. As a family are regular users of this community facility. Can walk to it. They then spend time in Purley, looking around the shops, and cafes. The pool is accessible for all with disabled parking bay outside it. This is a recreational facility that is used frequently by many disabled children and adults -as there are many that reside in Purley, where else would they go?</p> <p>The leisure facilities enhance the experience of going into Purley, our cinema went many years ago, it would be devastating to now lose this facility, and so wrong. This pool and gym is at the heart of Purley for its local residents, and should remain this way, if redevelopment is necessary then a swimming pool and gym must be built in the centre of Purley. Please consider the local residents and the many people who rely on this local facility, and keep Purley pool and gym open.</p>	Keep Purley pool and gym open, retain the leisure facility in Purley.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0168/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mary Fitzgerald	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Object to closure of Purley Pool.	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0169/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Roseline Laurence	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I am and have been a regular user of Purley Pool for about 20 years. I would ask you please to see that the Croydon Local Development Framework includes items which will ensure that the Pool and Gym in Purley stays open. If there is any need to redevelop the site then there should be provision for a 25 metres pool and a gym to remain in their present location.</p> <p>It appears to me that the pool and gym in Purley is well used. It is a good facility for people of all ages and abilities to learn to swim and to help to stay fit and healthy. Furthermore it would be a backward step for the well being of Purley Town centre to loose it's pool and gym.</p> <p>Please would you register my communication to you so that it is considered in any consultation in the processes for the Local Development Framework and any Development Plan for Croydon.</p>	Keep Purley pool, and if redevelop the site ensure provision for a 25 metres pool and gym in their present location.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0170/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mr David Laurence

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I use Purley Pool regularly and I would like to let you know that I am concerned to hear that there is any possibility of it closing in the coming years. From my observations I would say that the pool is well used and a valuable asset to the town. It not only provides a means of young and old to keep fit and healthy but it is also something that draws people into Purley town centre where they make purchases in the many small businesses nearby. I certainly use the small businesses in Purley Town Centre because I swim there. I do get a sense that commerce in Purley is struggling and the loss of this sports and leisure facility would be a retrograde step for the economic well being of the town. It would also diminish access for local people to health and fitness facilities.

I have been using the pool for many years and I would very much like the Croydon Local Plan to provide the framework that ensures the swimming pool, sports and leisure facility remains open in Purley Town Centre. My strong preference would be for the pool to remain open on its present site. If there is a justifiable reason for the site to be redeveloped then the site should include a 25 metres swimming pool and gym.

Keep Purley pool open on its present site
If there is a justifiable reason for the site to be redeveloped then the site should include a 25 metres swimming pool and gym.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

The Leisure Centre at Purley with its swimming pool and gymnasium is an integral part of a development embracing the Council's public car-park and a now defunct supermarket originally occupied by Sainsburys. The car-park is extensively used throughout the year, by commuters working mainly in London and by those wishing to shop locally. The swimming pool is also used by commuters who choose to take exercise prior to or following work and by local residents especially pensioners who are keen to retain their fitness and by those who exercise to overcome some disability. School children both in classes and as individuals are also users of this popular facility. It has been shown that swimming is an excellent activity that exercises most muscle groups and the cardiorespiratory system. It is suitable for all ages and fitness levels placing little stress on joints. It is recommended by the medical profession and I have little doubt that it aids to minimise patient levels at doctor's surgeries and hospitals. The recently opened Waddon pool complex does not meet the needs of the Purley swimmers in that it is difficult to access particularly in the morning and there is insufficient car-parking. It is clearly unsuitable for commuters and to those who may choose additionally to shop. To build a pool on a main road very close to one of the busiest road intersections in the Borough does not encourage children or pensioners wishing to use this facility. Furthermore, I am opposed to building a pool in Coulsdon, on the periphery of the borough, as it will serve fewer residents than one built centrally. I am clearly an advocate for the retention of the Purley pool complex including the car-park but if it can be shown that there is a more suitable use for the site which will benefit the community as a whole I would not object. Provided always, that a new 25 metre pool offering similar facilities was constructed and opened foremost and is sited in close proximity to existing transport and shopping facilities. This would then allow continuity of swimming and a continuation of use by commuters.

Keep Purley pool or ensure a 25 metre pool is built in Purley offering similar facilities and opened foremost and is sited in close proximity to existing transport and shopping facilities. Do not build a pool in Coulsdon, on the periphery of the borough where it will serve fewer residents.

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

The Leisure Centre at Purley with its swimming pool and gymnasium is an integral part of a development embracing the Council's public car-park and a now defunct supermarket originally occupied by Sainsburys. The car-park is extensively used throughout the year, by commuters working mainly in London and by those wishing to shop locally. The swimming pool is also used by commuters who choose to take exercise prior to or following work and by local residents especially pensioners who are keen to retain their fitness and by those who exercise to overcome some disability. School children both in classes and as individuals are also users of this popular facility. It has been shown that swimming is an excellent activity that exercises most muscle groups and the cardiorespiratory system. It is suitable for all ages and fitness levels placing little stress on joints. It is recommended by the medical profession and I have little doubt that it aids to minimise patient levels at doctor's surgeries and hospitals. The recently opened Waddon pool complex does not meet the needs of the Purley swimmers in that it is difficult to access particularly in the morning and there is insufficient car-parking. It is clearly unsuitable for commuters and to those who may choose additionally to shop. To build a pool on a main road very close to one of the busiest road intersections in the Borough does not encourage children or pensioners wishing to use this facility. Furthermore, I am opposed to building a pool in Coulsdon, on the periphery of the borough, as it will serve fewer residents than one built centrally. I am clearly an advocate for the retention of the Purley pool complex including the car-park but if it can be shown that there is a more suitable use for the site which will benefit the community as a whole I would not object. Provided always, that a new 25 metre pool offering similar facilities was constructed and opened foremost and is sited in close proximity to existing transport and shopping facilities. This would then allow continuity of swimming and a continuation of use by commuters.

Keep Purley pool or ensure a 25 metre pool is built in Purley offering similar facilities and opened foremost and is sited in close proximity to existing transport and shopping facilities. Do not build a pool in Coulsdon, on the periphery of the borough where it will serve fewer residents.

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0171/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mr Barry Kay

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

The Leisure Centre at Purley with its swimming pool and gymnasium is an integral part of a development embracing the Council's public car-park and a now defunct supermarket originally occupied by Sainsburys. The car-park is extensively used throughout the year, by commuters working mainly in London and by those wishing to shop locally. The swimming pool is also used by commuters who choose to take exercise prior to or following work and by local residents especially pensioners who are keen to retain their fitness and by those who exercise to overcome some disability. School children both in classes and as individuals are also users of this popular facility. It has been shown that swimming is an excellent activity that exercises most muscle groups and the cardiorespiratory system. It is suitable for all ages and fitness levels placing little stress on joints. It is recommended by the medical profession and I have little doubt that it aids to minimise patient levels at doctor's surgeries and hospitals. The recently opened Waddon pool complex does not meet the needs of the Purley swimmers in that it is difficult to access particularly in the morning and there is insufficient car-parking. It is clearly unsuitable for commuters and to those who may choose additionally to shop. To build a pool on a main road very close to one of the busiest road intersections in the Borough does not encourage children or pensioners wishing to use this facility. Furthermore, I am opposed to building a pool in Coulsdon, on the periphery of the borough, as it will serve fewer residents than one built centrally. I am clearly an advocate for the retention of the Purley pool complex including the car-park but if it can be shown that there is a more suitable use for the site which will benefit the community as a whole I would not object. Provided always, that a new 25 metre pool offering similar facilities was constructed and opened foremost and is sited in close proximity to existing transport and shopping facilities. This would then allow continuity of swimming and a continuation of use by commuters.

Keep Purley pool or ensure a 25 metre pool is built in Purley offering similar facilities and opened foremost and is sited in close proximity to existing transport and shopping facilities. Do not build a pool in Coulsdon, on the periphery of the borough where it will serve fewer residents.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0173/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ian Beck	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	We use Purley swimming pool for regular exercise. The convenient location of the pool has made it easy to encourage enthusiasm for swimming. I would strongly urge that you maintain the pool on its existing site. Were you to consider the need for a re-development of the Purley Pool, I hope that you would insist that the plan contain the inclusion of both a swimming pool and a gym.	Keep Purley pool. If there is a need for a re-development of the Purley Pool, the plan must contain the inclusion of both a swimming pool and a gym.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0174/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Lily Garnett	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Please don't shut down the pool. My family thinks it's important to swim as it is an important skill. My brother goes to swimming lessons every Friday and I go to swimming lessons every Wednesday. My mum enjoys her swim and says it is a sport that every one can do. My school have lessons as well at Purley. This is a tiny part of what this local swimming pool does.	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0175/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mrs R Thompson	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Please, please keep Purley Pool open. We need this pool! It is always very busy and so close to the train station for easy access. Lots of us only go to Purley to use the pool and then we use the shops there too. It would be madness to lose this amazing local resource. Keep the pool open. As a taxpayer it makes sense to keep it open and the locals, happy and healthy!	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0176/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Rachel Garnett	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>As a resident I would like to make it very clear in any up coming plans for Purley, how essential it is to have a swimming pool and gym. I am a regular user of the pool - at least three times a week - its location means I can drop my children at school, go swimming and then get the train to work and be in the office on time.</p> <p>My children both have swimming lessons at Purley Pool - both of whom are doing well in learning to swim. Their school also uses it. The pool is very busy and well used. I even know a 92 year old who is a regular user.</p> <p>Local business benefit from the pool. People use the shops and cafes after swimming. They travel to Purley to use this pool - which shows how much people need it.</p> <p>The pool is one of very the few things for people to do in Purley that doesn't involve eating or alcohol. Roads will be further clogged if we are forced to go to Waddon and I simply won't be able to do this before work.</p> <p>Purley would be a dying town without the huge boost this vital resource brings - we can't lose our pool.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0177/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Dr Bernie Byrnes	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>As someone who regularly uses Purley Pool, I am concerned to hear that there may be plans for it's closure. As the only affordable pool in the area (the private gyms are extortionate with ridiculous lock-in contracts) it is a vital resource to the local community as well as myself. I am very keen that the proposed redevelopment plan ensures that the swimming pool and gym remain in Purley on its present site or, if there should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a swimming pool and gym would be built on the same site or nearby.</p> <p>I am on a low wage but do important work with challenged young people in the South East. I need to be physically fit and strong in order to carry out my activities. Purley Pool provides a pleasant and affordable place to achieve this and is near enough to my house that I can jog there.</p>	Keep Purley pool open, or that the proposed redevelopment plan ensures that the swimming pool and gym remain in Purley on its present site or, if there should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a swimming pool and gym would be built on the same site or nearby.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0178/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ray Morriss	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>It is apparent that the protection of Community facilities given in DM18.1 is completely removed by clause 18.2b, since all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage, and so clause 18.2b must be deleted.</p> <p>Do the right thing!</p>	Delete Policy DM18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0178/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Ray Morriss	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Purley has an excellent leisure centre, including a much-used swimming pool and gym, which it is important to keep for both the benefit of it's residents health and fitness, and the well being of Purley itself. There are many ways in which Purley could be improved, and a start has already been made with the renovation of the local hospital, and there are plans in hand to improve the Baptist Church. Keeping or indeed improving the leisure centre would therefore prove plans to make Purley a vibrant area are serious.	Keep Purley pool.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0179/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	MP Williams	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	My family use this pool quite often and would hate to see it closed down,as the nearest one is some miles away.Purley has lost a lot of shops and amenities over the past few years and to see another one go is really awful.Please dont close it	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0180/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Anne Gasnola	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	I see Purley as a lively place to eat and keep fit with the very good council gym and pool, without which the place would be dead and could be renamed Tesco village. The pool is is important for local children to learn to swim and the elderly to keep fit.	Keep Purley pool.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0180/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Anne Gasnola	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Also the protection of facilities in clause DM 18 is completely removed by clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be within a shopping parade, so 18.2b should be deleted.	Delete Policy 18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0181/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Susan Arrol	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	The protection of Community facilities with pools given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b should and must be deleted.	Delete Policy DM 18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0181/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Susan Arrol	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Our vision for Purley is a bustling town which encompasses a vibrant commuter centre, a busy shopping area with plenty of places to eat and drink with friends and family and naturally a popular well attended leisure centre. The leisure centre and swimming pool is an integral and important part of life in Purley and is fully supported by the councillors of Purley and Kenley, the leaders of all main parties as well as a vast majority of the town's inhabitants and nearby schools.	Keep Purley leisure centre and pool.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
				This facility ,we feel, must remain at its present or nearby site as it is part of the health and life blood of the town centre.			
0182/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Fleury Charles	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	I have been a registered member of Purley leisure centre since the early nineties. I use the facility regularly to swim, at least 4-5 times a week. The Leisure centre serves not only Purley residents, commuters and schools, but also its neighbouring towns from south of the borough. The town has excellent transport links, which is why the centre is so popular. I therefore cannot understand why over the years there has been so much discussion about its closure. The leisure centre is a fundamental part of this town and its closure would have a detrimental effect on the local community that use it on regular basis.	Keep Purley pool or rebuild it in its current location or nearby and include this in Section 11.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
				If the reason for the proposed closure is due to it not being economically viable, due to its age, then why not rebuild it at its current location or at least nearby, I know this recommendation is supported by all our local councillors and has been raised with all our main parties. I ask that my recommendations be included in Croydon Plan section 11.			
0183/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Peta Barber	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	It is also equally important that the protection of Community facilities given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore I must stress that clause 18.2b must be deleted	Delete policy DM18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0183/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Peta Barber	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I write to you to tell you that it is most important for Purley pool to remain. I have a vision for Purley as a vibrant commuter centre with lively shopping areas, pleasant places to eat and an excellent leisure centre.</p> <p>The leisure centre is a most important part of the town and to keep it on its present site or one closeby has the support not only of the councillors of Purley and Kenley but also of the leaders of all the main parties.</p>	Keep Purley pool.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0184/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr David Lewis	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>For Purley to be sustainable it needs a purpose. It cannot compete with Coulsdon on a pure shopping basis and the Council is investing in developing Coulsdon. An alternative is needed for Purley and community needs, centred on the symbiosis between the Hospital and the Pool and Gymnasium surely form a basis for the building of a cohesive purpose for the centre, which will then support shops, cafes, library and other facilities. This needs to be written explicitly into then plan</p>	The protection of Purley's community facilities needs to be included in the Local Plan.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0185/01/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mrs Valerie Hunter	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>Car Parking Keeping a car park of substantial size is also essential for the survival of Purley shops. The chance is getting a space in the few on-street places available is unlikely. Many people do not live near a bus stop, have mobility problems, or several young children, and cannot use a bus - or even need to go to Purley Hospital with its many increased clinics etc but limited parking. A nearby car park is essential.</p> <p>Therefore both Purley Pool and car park should be kept open - and must be part of any future development.</p>	Keep Purley car park open and ensure its use is part of any future development.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0185/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mrs Valerie Hunter

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

SWIMMING IS NOT ONLY A
HEALTHY EXERCISE, BUT A LIFE
SAVER !

Keep Purley Pool open and include use in No change
any future development.

The Policy has been
reviewed and the community
facility at Purley Pool has
been removed from the main
retail frontage to avoid any
unintended consequences

Other activities are limited to certain
age groups, or need considerably
more space per person, or only
suitable for good weather.
No other activity can provide so many
people at the same time with healthy
exercise.

There should be MORE SWIMMING
POOLS !

Purley has good transport access,
and is highly connected for all. A
good location for a pool.
Apparently in 2007, 'consultants' [no
doubt expensive] advised the
Council that central Coulsdon would
be more suitable for a pool than
Purley to serve south of the borough,
planned on the site of Coulsdon's
Lion Green car park. Why ? - who
knows ! A much longer journey on
buses, maybe two buses instead of
one, or more petrol costs and road
usage
for car drivers from most areas -
and more convenient for those
outside Croydon than the areas
mentioned above.

Six years later planning permission
for that site is being sought - BUT
DOES NOT INCLUDE A SWIMMING
POOL !

This is yet another reason why the
swimming pool at Purley must be
kept !

My children (in the Purley Oaks area
part of South Croydon) used to
regularly go swimming at Purley
pool - with the school or by
themselves with friends. Now my
small granddaughters who live in
Kenley go with their parents to Purley
pool. They too will be able to go by
themselves when older. For both
groups an easy one-bus journey.

0186/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Mrs Sally Wilkin

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I would draw your attention to Policy DM18.2 of the Croydon Plan which states that the Council will not permit the loss of existing community facilities unless:

Keep Purley pool open. And if redeveloped ensure new facilities provided before any demolished.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

a. It can be demonstrated that there is no need for the existing premises or land for a community use and that it no longer has the ability to serve the needs of the community. I have been a regular user of Purley Swimming Pool since it opened. My husband and friends also regularly attend the pool. When our children were younger we paid for them to have lessons at the pool and we attended as a family every Sunday morning. My daughter also used the gym. Whenever I attend the early morning sessions and my husband the evening sessions we find that the pool is used by a good number of longstanding patrons. Quite a few of the pool users that I know personally are of retirement age and the pool is a great place to meet their friends while keeping fit at the same time. There are also a number of patrons, who like myself, attend before or after work. In my view, other than requiring a good clean and regular maintenance there is nothing wrong with Purley Swimming Pool.

b. The existing use is located on the ground floor within a Main Retail Frontage, a Secondary Retail Frontage, a Shopping Parade or a Restaurant Quarter Parade;

My comment:

Purley Pool has been an important part of Purley High Street since the 1970's, providing a much needed leisure/learning facility for a full age range of local inhabitants. I go to Purley at least twice a week for swimming, banking, visiting the post office, Tesco, Sainsbury's, dentist, doctor, pub and library. Purley is a great little town because there are a lot of useful facilities in one small area, easily accessible by foot, bus, train and car, which must be good for reducing carbon emissions.

c. Community facilities of equivalent floor space (either on or off site as part of a comprehensive redevelopment) that meets the current or future needs are provided.

My comment:

Purley is very local to me (approx. 1 mile) and I find it very useful to be able to get there on foot, by bus, train or car. Purley swimming pool recently had to close for routine

maintenance and I did try to get to the new pool at Waddon but in the end it proved too time-consuming to fit into my busy schedule to drive over to the Purley Way amidst the rush hour traffic. Driving to the Waddon Pool is my only way of getting there as there is no direct bus or train link available to me from Sanderstead and it is certainly too far to walk.

As far as I know, there are no other current or planned local swimming pools that would meet the needs of Sanderstead and Purley residents other than Purley Swimming Pool. Croydon Council has a poor record of replacing lost swimming pool facilities and it is essential to obtain new facilities before there is any question of Purley Swimming Pool being redeveloped. I am talking of the Scarbrook Road baths, the open air Purley Way swimming pool and the Water Palace- all demolished because Croydon Council preferred to offer empty promises of new pools rather than pay to maintain existing facilities. I am seriously worried that the same will happen with Purley Swimming Pool. In conclusion, Purley Swimming Pool is very important to me, my family, friends and my local community

0187/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Jenny Shannon	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I was concerned to read in the local press that this Plan includes a section stating that a community facility can be closed if it is located on a shopping parade. This to me seems to be directly pointing towards the possible closure of Purley Pool.</p> <p>Many people who use that pool, for health reasons, as well as pleasure, would not be able to travel as far as the Purley Way site.</p> <p>I myself use the pool as help for my bad back, but it is the children of Coulsdon, Old Coulsdon, Kenley, Whytelafe, Purley, Sanderstead, Selsdon that I worry for.</p> <p>I know many parents who are happy for their older children to travel unaccompanied to Purley Pool but would not allow them to journey alone to the Purley Way site.</p> <p>The fear locally is that facilities for residents of the south of the borough will be overlooked.</p>	Keep Purley pool open.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
----------------------------------	---------------	--------	-----------------	--	------------------------	-----------	--

0188/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Fiona Porter	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>My family and I have used Purley Pool since it was first opened in 1982. It was where my children, now grown up, learnt to swim and I continue to enjoy swimming there several times a week.</p> <p>While I appreciate that some refurbishment is now needed, I consider that closure of the pool, without a replacement in Purley, would be a real loss to the town. The swimming pools at New Addington, South Norwood, Thornton Heath and Waddon provide oppportunities for swimming for the rest of the borough leaving Purley, with its good transport links and adequate parking, as the ideal site to cover the south of the borough. We should be capitalising on the inspiration of last year's Olympics by providing as many sporting opportunities as possible and swimming has long been recognised as an ideal form of exercise for all ages and fitness levels.</p> <p>Purley has changed much, for better and worse, since we moved here in 1978. Retaining a pool in Purley ensures that people continue to come to Purley and regard us an attractive destination instead of just passing through. I understand that our local councillors and the leaders of the main parties support the retention of the pool.</p> <p>I would also urge inclusion of a pool in Purley in the Croydon Local Plan.</p>	Keep Purley pool and include this in the Croydon Local Plan.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0189/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Richard G Watson	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	<p>I regularly use Purley Pool and my two children who have both followed the excellent and very popular swimming lessons. The leisure facilities there are well used by all ages and enhance the experience of going to Purley.</p> <p>I would ask that the Croydon Local plan specifically references that the pool and gym should remain on its present site and if there is a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped a swimming pool and gym must be provided for</p>	Coydon Local plan should specifically reference that the pool and gym and that they should remain on the present site and if there is a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped a swimming pool and gym must be provided for.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0190/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Sarah Watson

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I am writing in support of Purley pool. We visit this facility weekly on Saturdays and both my children have undertaken swimming lessons there for many years. My son continues to have lessons weekly and my daughter attends the pool with friends. Swimming is a wonderful leisure activity and a great way to stay healthy for all the family not to mention a vital life skill. Living a 10-15 min walk away we always walk to the pool which is a major reason that we use it. We would not use a pool we could not walk to as sitting in the car or a bus in traffic to get to an alternative pool would not be an option for us. We have made many friends via our regular use of the pool and using it is always a socialable pleasant experience and really is the major reason for us going into town on a Saturday. Whatever the plans are for Purley I would urge you to consider keeping a pool, I think if we were to lose it there would be little reason for spending time in the town centre and it would fall further into decay.

In addition, I do feel that the council has a responsibility to provide a facility that can be enjoyed by all our community (and being in purley town centre so accessible to many) that encourages healthy activity.

Keep Purley pool.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0191/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Frances Wood

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I email to request that you keep Purley swimming pool. The pool has been there for a number of years and whilst it may not be as big as the new one near the Purley Way, it is still a valid pool. It has a community sense to it and people can go there without having to get three buses or walk miles (depending where they live) to the Purley Way (on a busy, dirty, little filled, dusty road in the unpleasant location of the Purley Way). Instead Purley is a place people can meet up at to chat, socialise and eat or drink after swimming. The pool continues to be very important in keeping up the community in Purley. It is a place that would gain by money being put into the area rather than further pulling society away from the area. Purley is still struggling to keep it's sense of community after the massive (and dare I say unpleasant and ugly worn out building of) Tesco's took away a great deal of community by making the place more of a drive through and a charity shop location. We have the smaller Sainsburys there now which opens up that area beside the pool.

Keep Purley pool and it should be included in the Croydon Plan under section 11.

Change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

I have been informed that the Councillors of Purley and Kenley and the leaders of all main parties for Croydon and the surrounding area support the idea of keeping a swimming pool in the area. Plus we have to encourage exercise for the current adult generation and their children to stop obesity in Croydon. This will combat against the many fast food outlets that Croydon Council seem to let happen. Croydon should promote exercise at a reasonable price rather than remove facilities that encourage exercise and socialising. If the pool is closed, we will have small, overpriced flats which are not as attractive 5 years after the builders have left or we will have another supermarket (as they are all taking over the high streets in the name of competition) or betting shops (increasing poverty).

Children can still use the pool for school swimming where schools still teach swimming and swimming lessons really do save lives. The larger pool at Purley Way is not a social place as it is too big and is pushing private gym membership over access to swimming at a good public service rate. We are not all wealthy. Plus the staff there are not friendly and not open about the lower, discount rates for the unemployed, disabled and older generation.

0191/01/003/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Frances Wood	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	The protection of Community facilities with pools given in clause DM18.1 is completely removed by the clause 18.2b because all council leisure centres with pools can be said to be located within a shopping parade or retail frontage. Therefore clause 18.2b ought to be removed too	Delete DM18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0192/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Martin Clarke	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Purley Swimming Pool must remain open as a facility for both young and old. It is widely used by many people in the area. It is well situated for easy access by road and public transport and is an important part of Purley town centre. When considering the Plan for Purley, in my view the Pool and gym should be an intergral part of the proposals. Should the present site be developed, plans must be in place to replace the pool/gym on a nearby site again in the Purley area.	Keep Purley pool and gym. Should the present site be developed, plans must be in place to replace the pool/gym on a nearby site again in the Purley area.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0193/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mrs Gwyneth Smith	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	We have lived in Purley for over 17 years and regularly use all the facilities that Purley offers including the pool and gym. In the present economic situation this leisure facility provides a social meeting place as well as a venue to take exercise which is a hot topic with the Government at this present time. It is ideally placed in the High Street which offers a variety of shopping facilities including a bank, chemist, hairdresser, beauty therapist and newsagent, to name just a few, as well as a variety of eating venues all of which are regularly used by locals and visitors both day and night. I know there are plans to redevelop this site which includes the car park, swimming pool and gym. I strongly urge you to retain the pool and gym on this site as it is located in the ideal vicinity for all their customers. However, if it is vitally necessary to move it elsewhere, please position it somewhere very close by. It would be a travesty to close this much used facility and I do hope that you will be able to find a way to save it. In the event that the site is redeveloped and the pool moved then please build and open the new one before the old one is closed in order to maintain exercise and social facilities for all the people of Purley.	Keep Purley pool and gym, and if the site is redeveloped please provide a new facility before the existing one is closed, and locate it nearby.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0194/01/001/DM18
(Option 1)/O

Liz Davey

Object

DM18 (Option 1)

I would just like to express my opinions about the lack of inclusion of Purley Pool within the new Local Plan for Purley.

Keep Purley pool and include it in the Local Plan.

No change

The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

We regularly use the pool and have swimming lessons. I have grown up knowing and using Purley Pool and feel that it provides a vital leisure facility for the southern part of the borough, and I am concerned that the pool may potentially be closed in the medium to long term without adequate provision being put in place (i.e. an alternative pool in Purley/Coulsdon). It has also recently undergone some redecoration (tiling and painting), which has improved the pool and reception area considerably.

A new pool has been established on the Purley Way (Waddon Leisure Centre), but the parking is inadequate and the majority of leisure centre users are forced to park in the Wing Yip complex opposite, which creates added pressure on resources for the Wing Yip centre, which will undoubtedly result in parking restrictions being implemented by the commercial centre to protect its customers, which I can perfectly understand. Waddon Centre is not a viable alternative for Purley Pool users due to the parking and the less favourable public transport links. Purley Pool has the advantage that it can easily be reached by bus or train, rendering it far more accessible to local residents than Waddon Pool, and there is ample parking, with the multi-story car park opposite the station, with access directly down to the side of Purley Pool.

I would simply like to urge you to include Purley Pool in the Local Plan, and I sincerely hope to be able to use Purley Pool, together with the rest of my family, for many years to come.

0195/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Mr Bob Bray	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	As a Purley resident of over 30 yrs, I am concerned that our local pool is under threat. So I am writing to let you know that I use the pool on a regular basis (minimum) of three times per week plus the various other leisure facilities within Purley. Over the years we have seen Purley deteriorate but now with the refurbished hospital, and more shops restaurants opening there is a 'new buzz' about the area that is fully enhanced with the leisure facilities currently available. Being local I am able to walk or cycle to my local pool which helps to maintain my general health and fitness which hopefully will enhance my life now that I have recently retired. The thought of having to travel to pools in different parts of the Borough would be onerous and therefore realistically would not happen. So please make sure that the leisure facilities which include the pool are incorporated within the future plan of our community facilities.	Keep a pool in Purley-ensure that the leisure facilities which include the pool are incorporated within the future plan of our community facilities.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0196/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Irina Berard	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	We live in Kenley and use Purley swimming pool several times a week including swimming lessons. The pool is very well maintained, has friendly and helpful staff. The swimming pool is a vital part of our life and is an important facility Purley has to offer. It is very crucial to have a local swimming pool in the area and Purley swimming pool with a gym facility does an excellent job. The pool is easy to get to, it has a parking facility along with street parking as well as many places around it to eat a drink. What we really want is for the Purley swimming pool to remain in Purley on its present site and should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a swimming pool and gym must be built on the same site prior to closure of the present facility.	Keep Purley pool and should there be a justified reason for the site to be redeveloped, a swimming pool and gym must be built on the same site prior to closure of the present facility.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0197/01/001/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Chris Stanley <i>Kenley and District Residents Asso</i>	Object	DM18 (Option 1)	Purley pool is a well used facility and it is an important amenity for the residents of Kenley as well as Purley. It is an essential community facility that is also needed to keep the Purley town centre active and alive, and available for future generations. We are now making a formal request that a Swimming Pool and Gym be entered into the plan for Purley so that future planners and developers know the request of the local population. The present and future population need this type of community facility nearby; the alternative closest Croydon Borough public baths are Waddon.	Keep Purley pool and incorporate it in the plan for Purley.	No change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

0197/01/002/DM18 (Option 1)/O	Chris Stanley <i>Kenley and District Residents Asso</i>	Object		DM18 (Option 1)	We are concerned with point DM18.2b as this seems to give the planners a possibility of closing the pool. We believe this point should be removed.	Delete DM18.2b.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences
0098/01/002/7.003/O	Mr Paul Crane	Object	Soundness - Justified	7.003	There is a shortfall in the number of primary school places, which seems to be getting more severe.	The severe lack of primary school places in the Riddlesdown/Purley area should be addressed before more new homes are developed.	No change	The Council as Local Planning Authority would not be able to refuse the development of new homes on these grounds. The Council is aware of the tight supply of school places in some parts of the borough and as Local Education Authority is undertaking a wide range of actions to address this.
0118/05/004/7.005/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object		7.005	Greater clarity as to the Council's expectations and strategy and compliance with the objectives in this paragraph need to be established and clearly set out to avoid unnecessary delay and confusion within the planning process.	Paragraph 7.5: greater clarity of the Council's and expectations and strategy should be provided.	Change	The wording of the policy and supporting text has been amended the clarify how the policy operates.
0146/01/001/DM18 (Option 2)/O	Janet Corcoran	Object		DM18 (Option 2)	I understand that Purley Pool is once again at risk of closure. I would like to comment that I believe it is a valuable resource for the community. My daughter and her friends go there often in the school holidays and would miss it greatly if it were closed. Another of my daughters also had swimming lessons there for many years. There are very few facilities for children in Purley and it would be a great shame if this closed. I realise that there is a new pool on the Purley Way but it is just not convenient for children to travel that far, on a slow bus route.	Keep Purley pool open.	Change	The Policy has been reviewed and the community facility at Purley Pool has been removed from the main retail frontage to avoid any unintended consequences

8 Environment and Climate Change

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0003/05/011/Non-specific/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>		Support			The use of SuDS where appropriate and as part of Green Infrastructure, Ecology/Biodiversity opportunities, is also welcomed and encouraged by Natural England. The reference to permeable surfaces and use of native planting can deliver this policy, whilst linking into other chapters/sections, helping to strengthen the document further.	Reference to permeable surfaces and the use of native planting will help to strengthen this document.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk which will encourage SuDS techniques such as permeable paving and planting.
0039/02/002/Non-specific/O	Carmelle Bell <i>Thames Water</i>		Object			Thames Water's justification for the need for policies in the Local Plan on infrastructure including the provision of adequate water and sewage infrastructure to assist delivery of new development:- Infrastructure delivery and phasing Thames Water support the recognition within Local Plans that infrastructure should be in place for new development where and when it is needed. It is essential to ensure that adequate water and sewerage infrastructure is delivered prior to development taking place, in order to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment, such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses, or water shortages with associated low-pressure water supply problems. However, the requirement for network upgrades will be dependent on the scale, location and point of connection of new developments and will also be affected by developments occurring elsewhere within the catchment. Water and sewerage undertakers have limited powers under the Water Industry Act (WIA) to prevent connection ahead of infrastructure upgrades and therefore rely heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure is provided ahead of occupation, either through phasing or the use of planning conditions. This is especially relevant to wastewater infrastructure where powers to control connection through the WIA are limited to the quality of construction of the connection to the sewer, rather than the suitability of the point of connection. It is therefore essential that developers demonstrate that adequate capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the proposed development and that it would not lead to additional capacity constraints for new and/or existing users.	Need for policies in the Local Plan on infrastructure including the provision of adequate water and sewage infrastructure to assist delivery of new development:- and Infrastructure delivery and phasing	No change	This level of detail regarding water infrastructure is not appropriate for the Detailed Policies.

0039/02/003/Non-specific/O

Carmelle Bell

Thames Water

Object

Infrastructure policies are required to be included in the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies and we propose a policy and supporting text. Thames Water considers it essential that the Local Plan makes reference to the provision of adequate water and sewerage infrastructure to serve development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment. It is important not to underestimate the length of time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. Local network upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to deliver, strategic infrastructure solutions can require 3 to 5 years and the implementing of new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years from the point of certainty of delivery. Therefore the phasing of major development will be crucial. The Local Plan Detailed Policies document does not contain any policies with regard to water and wastewater infrastructure and given the scale of development proposed within Croydon, and the acknowledged importance of water and waste water issues within the NPPF and London Plan, Thames Water consider a specific Policy on water and sewerage infrastructure is required. A suitable policy and supporting text is set out below-
PROPOSED POLICY - WATER AND SEWERAGE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY:
Planning permission will only be granted for developments which increase the demand for off-site service infrastructure where:
1. sufficient capacity already exists or
2. extra capacity can be provided in time to serve the development which will ensure that the environment and the amenity of local residents are not adversely affected.
When there is a capacity constraint and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, planning permission will only be granted where the developer funds appropriate improvements which will be completed prior to occupation of the development.”
It is considered that text along the following lines should be added to the Local Plan to support the above proposed Policy:
PROPOSED NEW POLICY :
The Council will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate infrastructure capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not

Infrastructure policies are required to be included in the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies -it is essential that the Local Plan makes reference to the provision of adequate water and sewerage infrastructure to serve development with a policy and supporting text.

No change

This level of detail regarding water infrastructure is not appropriate for the Detailed Policies.

lead to amenity impacts for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate appraisals and reports to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and wastewater infrastructure. Where there is an infrastructure capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by the water or wastewater company, the Council will require the developer to provide for the appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development.

SUPPORTING TEXT

A water and wastewater companies' investment programme is based on a 5 year cycle known as the Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. Thames Water are currently in the AMP5 period, which runs from 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2015 and does not therefore cover the full Local Plan period. AMP6 will cover the period from 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2020.

As part of our five year business plan Thames Water advise OFWAT on the funding required to accommodate growth to ensure their treatment works can continue to meet the standard required by treatment consents set by the Environment Agency. They base their investment programmes on a range of factors, including population projections and development plan allocations, which help to form the clearest picture of the future shape of the community.

0039/02/001/Non-specific/O

Carmelle Bell

Thames Water

Object

Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the Borough and the statutory water undertaker for part of the Borough. It is important that growth is delivered alongside the infrastructure required to support it including any necessary upgrades to wastewater infrastructure. In February 2012 a Statement of Common Ground was produced between Thames Water and the London Borough of Croydon in relation to the Core Strategy. This set out that the Council did not want to repeat the content of Policy 5.1 of the London Plan but that the Council may include policies on water and wastewater infrastructure in the detailed policies and sites DPD. A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the Local Plan should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it requires to serve it and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.

The Council is referred to SP4, of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies, Policy 5.14 of the London Plan, and that boroughs should identify wastewater infrastructure requirements. The Council is referred to Paragraph 156 and 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012 and the Government's National Planning Practice Guidance sets out that: 'the preparation of Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage companies align with development needs.'

In view of the above, and particularly given the scale of development proposed in Croydon, it is considered that the detailed policies document should include suitable policies and supporting text to ensure that water and wastewater infrastructure requirements are delivered alongside development.

The detailed policies document should include suitable policies and supporting text to ensure that water and wastewater infrastructure requirements are delivered alongside development.

No change

Issues regarding water and wastewater infrastructure are dealt with in Policy SP6.3 and Paragraph 6.5 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. This level of detail regarding water infrastructure is not appropriate for the Detailed Policies.

0039/02/004/Non-specific/O

Carmelle Bell

Thames Water

Object

A water and wastewater companies' investment programme is based on a 5 year cycle known as the Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. Thames Water are currently in the AMP5 period, which runs from 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2015 and does not therefore cover the full Local Plan period. AMP6 will cover the period from 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2020.

As part of our five year business plan Thames Water advise OFWAT on the funding required to accommodate growth to ensure their treatment works can continue to meet the standard required by treatment consents set by the Environment Agency. They base their investment programmes on a range of factors, including population projections and development plan allocations, which help to form the clearest picture of the future shape of the community. Given the differences in the timescales of the planning processes for the Local Plan and Thames Water's investment programmes it is considered that a further policy should be included in the Local Plan to support the future development and expansion of water and waste water treatment works. This is necessary in order to ensure infrastructure is in place to accommodate growth, resilience and help address the impacts of climate change.

The draft NPPG supports this approach. It states that 'Plan-making may need to consider... In identifying sites it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has needs particular to the location (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered where consistent with their designation.'

It is suggested that the wording of the policy should be as follows:

PROPOSED NEW POLICY -

Utilities Development:

The development or expansion of water supply or waste water works will normally be permitted, either where needed to serve existing or proposed development in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan, or in the interests of long term water supply and waste water management, provided that the need for such works outweighs any adverse land use or environmental impact, or that any such adverse impact is minimised.

Similar policies to those proposed above have been adopted in other LDF documents including Policy DM9

Afurther policy should be included-support the future development and expansion of water and waste water treatment works. No change

Any future applications for expansion of water infrastructure should be considered like all other developments under existing policies.

of the London Borough of Sutton Site
Development Policies DPD and
Policy DM SD 10 of the London
Borough of Richmond upon Thames
Development Management Plan.

0070/02/001/Non-specific/C	<i>Ofwat</i>	Comment		The Water Services Regulation Authority (Ofwat) is the economic regulator for the water and sewage companies of England and Wales. Your correspondence relates to essentially a local matter in respect of impacts on water and sewerage service provision and in this respect the relevant water company/companies local to the area and the Environment Agency are your key Statutory Consultees.	We expect that the normal commercial arrangements will apply and that planning matters related to water and sewerage service provision will be resolved locally. I confirm we do not have any comments now and will not have any future comments regarding this planning application.	No change	
0127/01/017/Non-specific/O	Mr Richard Parish <i>English Heritage</i>	Object		The NPPF sets out the need for local authorities to meet proactively the challenge of climate change and support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy. We would therefore ask the Council to consider whether a policy stating that, 'The Council will encourage measures to improve energy efficiency where these can be shown to sustain or enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings.'	Add new policy stating 'The Council will encourage measures to improve energy efficiency where these can be shown to sustain or enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings.'		
0097/01/003/Non-specific/O	Mr Alastair Davis	Object		The most other important thing is flooding. Purley is very much at risk and little is ever done despite a lot of talk! I am no expert and have no real expertise, but assuming what Tarsam Flora has suggested is not prohibitively expensive it makes more sense than most I have heard about.	Consider flooding management methods for Purley.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0121/01/002/Strategic Objectives/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object	Strategic Objectives	Strategic Objective no.11- You have rightly referred to Flood Risk, but in my view this needs to be covered in more detail, either in a separate section dealing with flooding or included in Section 8 Environment and Climate Change.	Add policy on flood risk.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0003/05/013/DM19 (Option 1)S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	DM19 (Option 1)	Policy is welcomed and encouraged		Welcome support	

0054/05/003/DM19 (Option 1)/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object		DM19 (Option 1)	SP6.4 and SP6.5-6.10 in Strategic Policies outline good principles and clear direction but disappointing that there is no Detailed Policy to tackle flood risk. DM19 is the only policy which relates to Strategic Objective 11 but does not mention tackling flood risk, making space for water or utilising sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) SuDS will contribute to sustainable development and will contribute to enhancing amenity and aesthetic value of developed areas, as well as providing habitats for wildlife in urban areas and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. Tackling flood risk through making space for water and utilising SuDS will help to meet Strategic Objective 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10.	A policy to tackle flood risk.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0080/02/001/DM19 (Option 1)/O	Mrs Reiko Pepper	Object	Soundness - Justified	DM19 (Option 1)	There is no mention of pollution through flooding. The following applies to not only this policy but across all policies - CLP1, South London Waste Plan and the NPPF suffice in meeting strategic objectives.		No change	This is addressed in Policy SP6 and Paragraph 6.5 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0099/02/018/DM19 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM19 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	
0101/01/015/DM19 (Option 1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM19 (Option 1)	The borough will need an explanation as to how the Council will give "careful consideration to the air quality impacts of their development". The proposed Viridor incinerator should be regularly measured across the borough and remedial action taken if pollution exceeds a defined safe limit.	Air quality parameters should be specified or the statement "careful consideration to the air quality impacts of their development" will remain meaningless.	No change	Paragraph 8.14 states that the Council has produced an Interim Policy Guidance on Standards and Requirements for Improving Local Air Quality which developers should consult.
0118/06/003/DM19 (Option 1)/S	 <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Support		DM19 (Option 1)	DM19: the preferred policy approach is deliverable.		Welcome support	
0118/06/004/DM19 (Option 1)/S	 <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Support		DM19 (Option 1)	DM19: the preferred policy approach enables sustainable development.		Welcome support	
0118/06/002/DM19 (Option 1)/C	 <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Comment		DM19 (Option 1)	Air quality mitigation measures may also be addressed through CIL provisions.		No change	The Council notes this comment.
0118/06/001/DM19 (Option 1)/S	 <i>Redrow Homes</i>	Support		DM19 (Option 1)	The policy supports strategic objectives. The interim policy guidance for air quality is noted.		Welcome support	
0121/01/022/DM19 (Option 1)/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support		DM19 (Option 1)	Support Option 1		Welcome support	

0130/01/020/DM19 (Option 1)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support		DM19 (Option 1)	Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') for draft Policy DM19 states that the Council will promote high standards of development and construction throughout the Borough by (a) ensuring that future development that may be liable to cause, or be effected by, pollution through air, noise, dust or vibration, will not be detrimental to the health, safety and immunity of users of the site or surrounding land; and (b) ensuring mitigation measures are put in place to reduce the adverse impacts to acceptable levels (and where necessary for the Council to set planning conditions to reduce the impact on adjacent land uses to an acceptable level). We consider Option 1 to be a sensible approach to promote high standards of development and construction in Croydon		Welcome support	
0105/01/043/DM19 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object		DM19 (Option 1)	Do not think this is the most appropriate policy for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives and is not deliverable.. Para 8.013 The entire borough of Croydon is an Air Quality Management Area and therefore developers should give careful consideration to the air quality impacts of their proposed development. How? If the proposed incinerator is to be built at Beddington Lane, the air quality across the Borough at strategic points should be continually monitored. If the air quality impurities exceed a recognised safe limit, remedial action should be taken immediately to restore the air quality to safe limits.What is the Safe Limit? Unless the actual Air Quality parameters are specified this statement in paragraph 8.013 is meaningless.	Clarificaion of how developers can give careful consideration to the air quality impacts of their proposed developments and what is the safe limit for restoring air quality.	No change	Paragraph 8.14 states that the Council has produced an Interim Policy Guidance on Standards and Requirements for Improving Local Air Quality which developers should consult.
0054/05/004/DM19 (Option 2)/O	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Object		DM19 (Option 2)	Concerned that the preferred policy approach will have negative impact on reducing flood risk and there is no mitigation measure proposed according to the Sustainability Appraisal. Flood risk in different parts of the borough has not been taken into account in any of the local policies.	Policy should include a mitigation measure and should take into account of the flood risk in different parts of the borough.	Change	The Detailed Policies will contain a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and Reducing Flood Risk.
0099/02/019/DM20 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	DM20 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	

9 Green Grid

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0003/05/002/Non-specific/S	Mr David Hammond Natural England		Support			The provision of green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements in development applications is to be welcomed and encouraged, and has the potential to link into strengthen other council's policies.		Welcome support	
0107/01/007//O	David Harnes Chase Residents Association		Object			Question for Council: Please provide Green Spaces map for Addiscombe 'Place'.	Please provide Green Spaces map for Addiscombe 'Place'.	No change	A map of Local Green Spaces in Addiscombe can be provided for the Addiscombe Planning Forum to help with planning in Addiscombe.
0107/01/008//O	David Harnes Chase Residents Association		Object			Question for Council: Why can't Ashburton Playing Fields be designated (& therefore protected) ?	Explain why Ashburton Playing Fields can't be designated as Local Green Space.	No change	Ashburton playing fields are designated as Metropolitan Open Land which carries the same level of protection as Local Green Spaces.
0120/01/050/Non-specific/O	 ASPRA		Object			This section is very difficult to follow in the proposed plans. The Local Plan sets out 'Local places' e.g. Addiscombe, but Green spaces are not dealt with in the same way.	Revise this section so that Green spaces are dealt with in the same way as the local places section and is easier to follow.	No change	It is not possible to fit Addiscombe Place on an A4 landscape sheet at 1:10,000 scale so the Local Green Spaces have not been presented this way. At the Proposed Submission stage all the maps will be combined on an A0 Policies Map so this issue will not arise.
0120/01/049/9.014/O	 ASPRA		Object		9.014	Green space designation We are concerned that some have been excluded apparently on the grounds that there is no access to the general public. Nevertheless these provide valuable open areas and should be protected.	Change the criteria to allow land to be designated that does not have public access.	No change	Local Green Space designation is not about protecting valuable areas but offering extra protection to areas which are demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance. In order to demonstrate the Council thinks it has to be either be publicly accessible or have a number of special attributes such as nature importance, historic value and tranquility.
0118/01/002/9.027/O	 Redrow Homes		Object		9.027	DM22 and paragraph 9.27: this objective is understood and supported but the need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis should be made clearer within the Policy. This is to have regard to the need for achieving cost effective, viable design solutions to be utilised where high design standards can still be achieved.	Policy should make clearer the need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis.	No change	Developments proposals should accord with Plan once it is adopted unless there are material considerations otherwise. Each application will be treated on its merits including consideration of material considerations presented for any departure from adopted development plan policy.

0118/01/001/9.027/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	9.027	Policy DM22: The objectives of the policy and this paragraph seek to achieve the strategic objectives but the design requirement for green roofs in new developments needs to be applied pragmatically and in accordance with specific site design standards. This should be made clearer within the policy.	The policy should make clearer that the design requirement for green roofs in new developments needs to be applied pragmatically and in accordance with specific site design standards.	No change	Developments proposals should accord with Plan once it is adopted unless there are material considerations otherwise. Each application will be treated on its merits including consideration of material considerations presented for any departure from adopted development plan policy.
0092/01/005/9.044/S	<i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective 9.044	There are many acres of arable and grazing land (Grade 3a) off Rectory Park, Mitchley Hill and Mitchley Ave and the RRA would wish for this to be retained and where applicable for additional allotments to be allowed particularly in relation to the now derelict land off Mitchley Hill which is sub sold off and sub divided into residential plots. The RRA supports the policy of not losing all of this agricultural land.		Welcome support	
0028/03/013/9.048/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	9.048	Paragraph 9.48-9.49: Gayfere House and the paddock adjacent are almost completely surrounded by residential development and do not link well with other Green Belt uses in the surrounding area. This is a sustainable site, opposite local facilities and with other local facilities and with other infrastructure a short distance away.	Retain this site within the settlement area.	No change	The consultation looks at Development Management policies and the allocation of land for development will be considered as part of the Detailed Proposals, to be published in early 2015. The minor additions to the Green Belt contained in the Detailed Policies were proposed purely as a consequence of the introduction of the new Local Green Space designation which meant that some areas of existing Local Open Land contiguous with Green Belt needed to be redesignated as Green Belt to ensure their continued protection.
0119/01/003/9.049/S	<i>Tandridge District Council</i>	Support	9.049	The proposed minor amendments to the Policies Map(Paragraph 9.49)- The proposed minor extensions to the Metropolitan Green Belt shown as GB iv on Map GB-6 is supported as this is either in close proximity to Tandridge or adjoining the District.		Welcome support	
0119/01/002/9.049/S	<i>Tandridge District Council</i>	Support	9.049	The proposed minor amendments to the Policies Map(Paragraph 9.49)- The proposed minor extensions to the Metropolitan Green Belt shown as GB viii on Map GB-3 is supported as this is either in close proximity to Tandridge or adjoining the District.		Welcome support	

0119/01/004/9.049/S	<i>Tandridge District Council</i>	Support	9.049	The proposed minor amendments to the Policies Map(Paragraph 9.49)- The proposed minor extensions to the Metropolitan Green Belt shown as GBv on Map GB-8 is supported as this is either in close proximity to Tandridge or adjoining the District.		Welcome support	
0003/05/014/DM21 (Option 1)/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	DM21 (Option 1)	Policy is welcomed and supported.		Welcome support	
0028/03/014/DM21 (Option 1)/O	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	There is an opportunity to consider whether the Green Belt and other boundaries are the most appropriate, or if there are any opportunities to rationalise them, for example by including houses surrounded by development on the edge of the Green Belt. The limitation to extensions to buildings should be clearly defined to give applicants certainty. However, a limitation of 20% of floor space does not fully reflect impact on openness that is better measured by volume (especially given the potential height of some commercial buildings) and is very low.	It should be increased to 50% which will better reflect what might be available under permitted development rights.	No change	It is considered that measuring extensions by floorspace rather than volume is most appropriate. The threshold will remain at 20%.
0093/01/013/DM21 (Option 1)/O	Mr Martin Jones <i>Greater London Authority</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	This policy appears to suggest a blanket policy to all green spaces within the borough, in contrast to the approach set out in the NPPF and the Strategic Policies. Keen to ensure that designations within this policy did not affect the delivery of transport schemes in the borough, notwithstanding the welcome inclusion of explanatory paragraphs 9.11 to 9.13, which are important material considerations. Recommend that this policy option is revisited in combination with the upcoming site allocations review in order to establish a clear hierarchy of spaces that reflects their relevant importance and local need.	Review policy to ensure that the designation of local green spaces does not affect the delivery of transport schemes.	No change	Paragraph 78 of the NPPF states that "Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts".
0099/02/020/DM21 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective DM21 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	

0103/01/010/DM21 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	Support the Council's approach to protecting the green belt overall. However, the London Borough of Croydon is currently unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, and are also unable to identify specific deliverable sites or broad locations for growth in years 6-10 or 11-15 in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Core Strategy was found sound as the Inspector included that the impetus for any Green Belt Review should come from London Plan, which is the process of being reviewed. This review will state whether individual boroughs will be required to undertake a Green Belt review, dependent on the number of new homes they will be required to deliver. Due to the borough's constraints and the lack of brownfield sites, it is likely that a Green Belt review will be required in Croydon, through the London Plan Review. The supporting text to Policy DM21 should explain this.	The supporting text to Policy DM21 should explain a Green Belt Review, with the following text after paragraph 9.8: "If there is insufficient land in the built-up areas to meet the District's development needs, provision will be met by small scale extensions to the built-up areas following a review of the Green Belt boundary".	No change	Including such a statement would make the Detailed Policies not in conformity with the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies as a full Green Belt review is a strategic matter.
0103/01/013/DM21 (Option 1)/C	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Comment	DM21 (Option 1)	Support the Council's approach to protecting the green belt overall. However, the London Borough of Croydon is currently unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, and are also unable to identify specific deliverable sites or broad locations for growth in years 6-10 or 11-15 in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Core Strategy was found sound as the Inspector included that the impetus for any Green Belt Review should come from London Plan, which is the process of being reviewed. This review will state whether individual boroughs will be required to undertake a Green Belt review, dependent on the number of new homes they will be required to deliver. Due to the borough's constraints and the lack of brownfield sites, it is likely that a Green Belt review will be required in Croydon, through the London Plan Review.	Policy DM21 should include DM21.3 and state "the Council will review the existing Green Belt boundary through a Review of the Core Strategy following the adoption fo the London Plan Review, to ensure that there is sufficient land available to meet development requirements throughout the Plan period".	No change	This matter was dealt with at the examination in public for the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies and cannot be reopened in the Detailed Policies.
0103/01/011/DM21 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	DM21 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate to meet the Strategic Objectives.		No change	
0103/01/012/DM21 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	DM21 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.		No change	

0105/01/044/DM21 (Option 1)/O	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	Policy DM21 Option 1 does not meet Strategic Objectives set out in Section3 Area not included Add MORA area Glade Woods should be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: 1. Tranquil Area 2. Natural and semi-natural open space 3. Site of Nature Conservation Importance	Designate Glade Woods as a Local Green Space.	Change	Glade Woods will be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: close proximity to the community it serves; local in character and not part of an extensive tract of land; tranquil area; natural or semi-natural open space; and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0109/01/001/DM21 (Option 1)/C	Lesley Kaufman <i>Selsdon Tennis Club</i>	Comment	DM21 (Option 1)	Selsdon Tennis Club is to be designated as a Local Green Space. Registering intention to replace existing clubhouse with more modern premises to incorporate disabled facilities which could possibly be greater than 20% of current size. There is not a timescale for this development as currently looking at ways to raise funds.		Change	Change will be made to make it clearer that 20% criteria only applies to uses that are considered to be inappropriate in Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Local Green Spaces. It should not apply to uses such as essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation and a change will be made to clarify that.
0121/01/023/DM21 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	Recommend that a further paragraph is added to Option1 in that 'enhancement of Metropolitan Open Space will be permitted where it offers additional amenity value-such as water features,flood balancing,lakes etc.' Croydon needs to have this policy to resolve flooding issues in a sustainable manner.	A further paragraph should be added to Option1 stating 'enhancement of Metropolitan Open Space will be permitted where it offers additional amenity value-such as water features,flood balancing,lakes etc.'	No change	The listed uses are all acceptable in Metropolitan Open Land.
0129/01/034/DM21 (Option 1)/C	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Comment	DM21 (Option 1)	Dartnell Road recreation ground opposite Davidson primary school should be included as a Local Green Space.	Designate Dartnell Road recreation ground as a Local Green Space.	Change	Dartnell Road Recreation Ground will be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: close proximity to the community it serves; local in character and not part of an extensive tract of land; tranquil area; playing field or recreation ground; and publically accessible.
0107/01/006/DM21 (Option 1)/O	David Harnes <i>Chase Residents Association</i>	Object	DM21 (Option 1)	5. Green space designation Comment: Not easy to evaluate ! The Local Plan sets out 'Local places' e.g. Addiscombe, but Green spaces are not dealt with in the same way. The Local place of Addiscombe includes Addiscombe Railway Park (Gi) & Addiscombe Recreation Ground (L1) (both included & highlighted in the documents for our meeting) but Addiscombe 'Place' also includes Ashburton Park (G6) & Ashburton Playing Fields.	Explain why the following are not included in Addiscombe Place as Green Space designations: Ashburton Park (G6) & Ashburton Playing Fields.	No change	It is not possible to fit Addiscombe Place on an A4 landscape sheet at 1:10,000 scale so the Local Green Spaces have not been presented this way. At the Proposed Submission stage all the maps will be combined on an A0 Policies Map so this issue will not arise.

0092/01/013/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	Riddlesdown Residents Associatio	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM21 (Table 9.1)	Suggest an additional Local Green Space	The RRA would like to suggest adding the Green adjoining St Edmunds Church on Mitchley Ave/Lower Barn Rd junction as a Community Garden facility.	Change	The green adjoining St Edmund's Church is contiguous with the Purley Downs Green Belt so it does not meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Space. However, the Green Belt designation will be extended to include the green. This offers it the exact same protection as a Local Green Space designation.
0092/01/014/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	Riddlesdown Residents Associatio	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM21 (Table 9.1)	Suggest an additional Local Green Space	The RRA would like to suggest adding the Green opposite the shops in Lower Barn Rd adjoining Riddlesdown Station as a Community Garden facility.	Change	Lower Barn Road Green will be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: close proximity to the community it serves; local in character and not part of an extensive tract of land; tranquil area; and publically accessible.
0101/01/032/DM21 (Table 9.1)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM21 (Table 9.1)	Welcome the designation of Spring Park Wood as a Local Green Space		Welcome support	
0101/01/029/DM21 (Table 9.1)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM21 (Table 9.1)	Welcome the designation of Millers Pond as a Local Green Space		Welcome support	
0101/01/031/DM21 (Table 9.1)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM21 (Table 9.1)	Welcome the designation of Shirley Church Recreation Ground as a Local Green Space		Welcome support	
0101/01/033/DM21 (Table 9.1)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM21 (Table 9.1)	Welcome the designation of St John's Church as a Local Green Space		Welcome support	
0101/01/030/DM21 (Table 9.1)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM21 (Table 9.1)	Welcome the designation of Parkfields Recreation Ground as a Local Green Space		Welcome support	
0101/01/034/DM21 (Table 9.1)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support		DM21 (Table 9.1)	Welcome the designation of Temple Avenue Copse as a Local Green Space		Welcome support	
0101/01/036/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM21 (Table 9.1)	Glade Wood should be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: - Tranquil Area - Natural and semi-natural open space - Site of Nature Conservation Importance	Designate Glade Wood as a Local Green Space.	Change	Glade Woods will be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: close proximity to the community it serves; local in character and not part of an extensive tract of land; tranquil area; natural or semi-natural open space; and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.

0120/01/034/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM21 (Table 9.1)	Green Area: Addiscombe Recreation Ground (aka Bingham Road Rec.); Allotments and school Grounds backing onto Glenthorne Avenue & Shirley Road East side.	Designate these areas as Local Green Space	No change	Addiscombe Recreation Ground is already a proposed Local Green Space. The allotments and school grounds are designated as Metropolitan Open Land which carries the same weight as Local Green Space.
0120/01/055/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM21 (Table 9.1)	We would ask to designate the following as green spaces: the allotments between Glenthorne Avenue and Primrose Lane,	We would ask to designate the following as green spaces: the allotments between Glenthorne Avenue and Primrose Lane,	No change	The allotments are designated as Metropolitan Open Land which offers the same level of protection as Local Green Space.
0120/01/057/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM21 (Table 9.1)	We would ask to designate the following as green space:-the Whitgift Pond, in Mapledale Avenue	Designate the following as green space:- the Whitgift Pond, in Mapledale Avenue	Change	Whitgift Pond will be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: close proximity to the community it serves; local in character and not part of an extensive tract of land; tranquil area; natural or semi-natural open space; and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.
0120/01/056/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM21 (Table 9.1)	We would ask to designate the following as green space:-the Trinity School playing field	We would ask to designate the following as green space:-the Trinity School playing field	No change	This site has no public access and only meets one of the other criteria to be designated as Local Green Space.
0120/01/053/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM21 (Table 9.1)	We would ask to designate the following as green space: - Ashburton Playing Fields so that it gains protection	We would ask to designate the following as green space:- Ashburton Playing Fields so that it gains protection	No change	Ashburton Playing Fields are designated as Metropolitan Open Land which offers the same level of protection as Local Green Space.
0120/01/054/DM21 (Table 9.1)/O	ASPRA	Object	DM21 (Table 9.1)	We would ask to designate the following as green spaces: -The small Dartnell Rd recreation ground opposite Davidson primary school hasn't been included as a Local Green space. Another small space in Woodside, Apsley Rd, has been included as a Green space (G2). Why isn't Dartnell Rd recreation ground therefore included?	We would ask to designate the following as green spaces: -The small Dartnell Rd recreation ground opposite Davidson primary school hasn't been included as a Local Green space.	Change	Dartnell Road Recreation Ground will be designated as a Local Green Space as it meets the following criteria: close proximity to the community it serves; local in character and not part of an extensive tract of land; tranquil area; playing field or recreation ground; and publically accessible.
0003/05/015/DM22 (Option 1)/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	DM22 (Option 1)	Policy is welcomed and supported.		Welcome support	
0054/05/007/DM22 (Option 1)/S	Mr Charles Muriithi <i>Environment Agency</i>	Support	DM22 (Option 1)	use of Green Roofs is a positive approach.		Welcome support	
0099/02/021/DM22 (Option 1)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective DM22 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1.		Welcome support	

0103/01/020/DM22 (Option 1)/S	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Support	DM22 (Option 1)	DM22 Option 1: The preferred policy approach does not enable sustainable development.		No change	Until Thomson Ecology have either surveyed the site itself or verified the existing survey data that the objector possesses no change can be made to the existing designation.
0103/01/018/DM22 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM22 (Option 1)	DM22 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for meeting the Strategic Objectives.		No change	Until Thomson Ecology have either surveyed the site itself or verified the existing survey data that the objector possesses no change can be made to the existing designation.
0103/01/022/DM22 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM22 (Option 1)	A phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken by PJC Ecology in 2012, which found that baseline reasons for the site designation at Kent Gate Way could not be found. The report shows how ecological data search from biodiversity records centre GiGL did not show the site to have any designations for nature conservation or ecological value, and no further species could be identified to be associated with the ecological value of the assessment of the site. On the basis of current evidence there is no reason why the site should continue to be designated.	Remove the desingation from the site as Kent Gate Way as a Site of Nature Conservation.	No change	Our consultant ecologists were unable to gain access to this site so its designation will remain unchanged.
0103/01/019/DM22 (Option 1)/O	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Object	DM22 (Option 1)	DM22 Option 1: The preferred policy approach is not deliverable.		No change	Until Thomson Ecology have either surveyed the site itself or verified the existing survey data that the objector possesses no change can be made to the existing designation.
0105/01/045/DM22 (Option 1)/S	<i>Monks Orchard Residents Associa</i>	Support	DM22 (Option 1)	Support approach. Develop from udp. The preferred approach is deliverable		Welcome support	
0118/01/003//S	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Support		This policy is deliverable.		Welcome support	
0118/01/004/DM22 (Option 1)/O	<i>Redrow Homes</i>	Object	DM22 (Option 1)	This policy does not enable sustainable development.	Policy should make clearer the need for flexible interpretation on a case by case basis.	No change	Wording to this effect is not used in the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies as it would be vague. Developments proposals should accord with Plan once it is adopted unless there are material considerations otherwise. Each application will be treated on its merits including consideration of material considerations presented for any departure from adopted development plan policy.

0129/01/033/DM22 (Option 1)/O	<i>Addiscombe Liberal Democrats</i>	Object	DM22 (Option 1)	The biodiversity aims are reduced from London Policy guidelines. Concerns over consideration of biodiversity and wildlife dependent on "green corridors" for the viability of wildlife species. The role in which gardens play as green corridors has also been phased out and should be re-established.	Re-establish the role in which gardens play in green corridors.	No change	The role gardens play in biodiversity is covered in proposed policy DM4. Each policy within the Plan is given the same weight, as the Plan is taken as a whole. Therefore, policies on development on garden land will be given the same and equal regard as policies on biodiversity and an application can be refused on grounds of impact on biodiversity in a garden setting even if the site has no particular designation.
0103/01/021/9.023/C	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>	Comment	9.023	Paragraph 9.23 notes that the Council has commissioned further evidence to update the borough's local list of Sites of Nature Conservation and that this will be published later in 2013. We are promoting a site at Kent Gate Way (Lower Addington Village), which has historically been designated. We are aware that Thompson Ecology has reviewed the Nature Conservation sites within the borough, but were not able to gain access to the site. Please note that neither the landowner or the agent has been contacted to date, but should you need to assess the site please let us know.		No change	Our consultant Ecologists tried to contact the landowner and the agent but did not manage to get access to the site.
0130/01/021/DM22 (Option 2)/S	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Support	DM22 (Option 2)	Option 1 (ie the 'Preferred Option') of draft Policy DM22 seeks to enhance biodiversity across the Borough and improve 'access to nature'. To achieve this, Option 1 requires development proposals to meet a series of criteria, including incorporation of green roofs, green walls or equivalent measures within and on buildings as part of development proposals. We support Option 1 for draft Policy DM22 as set out in the consultation document.		Welcome support	
0003/05/016/DM23 (Option 1)/S	Mr David Hammond <i>Natural England</i>	Support	DM23 (Option 1)	Policy is welcomed and supported.		Welcome support	

0099/02/022/DM23 (Option 1)/O	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	DM23 (Option 1)	The CCG supports option 1 with the caveat that the Council should ensure a net gain in trees and that trees have space available to reach full growth.		No change	As large numbers of poor quality trees are often to removed to allow development it is not practical to expect tree replacement to correspond with tree removal. The best approach for replacement planting is to follow the principles of Right Place Right Tree set out in the Tree and Woodland Framework. The Tree and Woodland Framework is an important component of the London Plan and is included in Policy 7.21. Similar advice is recommended in BS5837, Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction (2012) which is already included in the policy. Paragraph 9.37 now makes reference to the Tree and Woodland Framework.
0121/01/024/DM23 (Option 1)/O	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Object		DM23 (Option 1)	Can you add a paragraph to DM23 Option 1, 'selective tree pruning' which does not destroy the character,natural shape of trees. Croydon's policy of badly pruning street trees is degrading the environment.	Add a paragraph to DM23 Option 1, 'selective tree pruning' which does not destroy the character,natural shape of trees.	No change	Tree preservation orders and conservation area regulations limit the extent to which trees can be pruned. Planning conditions can be used to ensure retained landscaping is maintained in an acceptable form. The principles of BS5837, Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction (2012) set out how best to achieve an acceptable relationship between trees and development, avoiding the need to heavily reduce retained trees. This document is already referenced in the policy. No other regulation of tree pruning is possible.
0128/01/007/DM23 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object		DM23 (Option 1)	The policy is not effective as ensuring the importance of trees should be considered as part of the design approach, not set apart from it and would be more effective if placed with the design based policy as set out in DM23 option 2.	Amend policy to ensure trees are considered as part of the design approach.	No change	The alternative option is not sufficiently robust or detailed. Option One will remain as the preferred option as it is supported by BS5837, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction (2012) which stresses the importance of arboricultural input at the design stage of a development. However, the policy will now make reference to DM11 which sets out the requirements for the retention and replacement of trees.
0128/01/006/DM23 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object		DM23 (Option 1)	This policy is not positively prepared and is likely to be an impediment to sustainable development.	Ensure policy is positively prepared.	No change	

0130/01/022/DM23 (Option 1)/O	<i>The Croydon Partnership</i>	Object	DM23 (Option 1)	Draft Policy DM23 sets out that the Council will seek to protect and enhance the Borough's woodlands, trees and hedgerows by, inter alia, not permitting development that results in (or could result in) the loss or excessive pruning of preserved trees or retained trees where they make a contribution to the character of the area. Whilst we support this policy in principle, we ask that should draft Policy DM23 be adopted in due course, it be supported by some appropriate guidance to applicants on the Council's criteria of how retained trees are deemed to make a contribution to the character of the area. In essence, the Council will need to quantify how 'contribution' is defined and measured. Whilst preserved trees are subject to Orders and, as such, their status is known and understood by all, 'retained trees which make a contribution to the character of the area' (as set out in Criterion B and C of draft Policy DM23) is a subjective matter and therefore guidance should be provided by the Council with regard to the practical application of this policy should it be adopted.	Policy DM23 Option 1, should be supported by some appropriate guidance to applicants on the Council's criteria of how retained trees are deemed to make a contribution to the character of the area. In essence, the Council will need to quantify how 'contribution' is defined and measured. Guidance should be provided by the Council with regard to the practical application of this policy DM23 should it be adopted..	No change	It is difficult to define character and contribution and make them more objective as character is not defined in the London Plan Policy 7.21 or in the Tree and Woodland Framework.
0128/01/008/DM23 (Option 1)/O	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Object	DM23 (Option 1)	DM23: do not consider the policy to deliver sustainable development.	Ensure policy to deliver sustainable development.	No change	The alternative option is not sufficiently robust or detailed. Option One will remain as the preferred option as it is supported by BS5837, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction (2012) which stresses the importance of arboricultural input at the design stage of a development. However, the policy will now make reference to DM11 which sets out the requirements for the retention and replacement of trees.
0128/01/010/DM23 (Option 2)/C	<i>Ikea Properties Investments Ltd</i>	Comment	DM23 (Option 2)	The associated text and paragraphs would need to be revised to reflect this new approach.	Amend the associated paragraphs to reflect DM23 Option 2.	No change	The alternative option is not sufficiently robust or detailed. Option One will remain as the preferred option as it is supported by BS5837, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction (2012) which stresses the importance of arboricultural input at the design stage of a development. However, the policy will now make reference to DM11 which sets out the requirements for the retention and replacement of trees.

0084/01/003/Open space in development (Option 1)/S	Mr Dale Greetham <i>Sport England</i>	Support		Open space in development (Option 1)	Welcomes this policy. However the required provision of indoor/outdoor sport facilities should be set out and the distinction made between what required infrastructure will be funded by CIL and what will be deemed site mitigation vis Section 106	The required provision of indoor/outdoor sport facilities should be set out and the distinction made between what required infrastructure will be funded by CIL and what will be deemed site mitigation vis Section 106	No change	The required provision for indoor and outdoor sports facilities is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which also provides detail on the possible funding sources. In addition, CIL funds all open space and the NPPF sets out the only circumstances where it would be required as off-site mitigation.
0099/02/024/Open space in development (Option 2)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	Open space in development (Option 2)	The CCG supports option 2.		No change	The policy on urban design and local character now includes new standards on provision of private amenity space in new developments that should address this comment.
0028/03/011/Other open land (Table 9.2)/C	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Comment		Other open land (Table 9.2)	9.48-9.49: Represent the owners of Gayfere House, Tollers Lane, Old Coulsdon. Map GB-2 shows the redesignation of the open space at the front to Green Belt. Previously promoted this site for an alternation to the Green Belt boundary to enable the development of the site and adjacent small paddock to provide for family housing which we understand is needed within the Borough. It is suggested that it would be logical to retain this space within the settlement area as it has more urban function than most of the surrounding Green Belt.	Retain this space within the settlement area.	No change	The site is contiguous with the existing Green Belt. Its urban character is not relevant to its proposed redesignation as it is only separated from the Green Belt by a band of trees and a fence.
0028/03/012/Other open land (Table 9.2)/C	Mr Andrew Steen <i>White & Sons</i>	Comment		Other open land (Table 9.2)	9.48-9.49: Note that the revised boundaries do not appear to be defensible, being small areas of land, many of which form a more urban function or appear to go into the urban area. There does not seem to have been any criteria of sustainability or otherwise for this Green Belt review. There does not appear to be an evidence base to confirm that some of these sites might have potential to be developed to provide some much needed family homes or community facilities.	Evidence base should be provided before the publication of the plan.	Change	Each of the proposed additions to the Green Belt meet at least one of the five tests for the inclusion of land in Green Belt. However, it is acknowledged that the Council needs to publish the evidence for this.
0092/01/006/Other open land (Table 9.2)/S	 <i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Support		Other open land (Table 9.2)	Support extension of Metropolitan Green Belt to include Land at Lower Barn Road		Welcome support	
0092/01/007/Other open land (Table 9.2)/S	 <i>Riddlesdown Residents Associatio</i>	Support		Other open land (Table 9.2)	Support extension of Metropolitan Green Belt to include Land on Riddlesdown Road.		Welcome support	

0101/01/037/Other open land (Table 9.2)/S	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Support	Other open land (Table 9.2)	Welcome the extension of Metropolitan Green Belt to include Bridle Road. This is a piece of land that the local community value. Regular litter picking and rubbish removal takes place organised by the community who have also funded the supply and fitting of both bird and bat boxes.	Welcome support		
0099/02/023/Productive Landscapes (Option 2)/S	Mr Adriaan Van Heerden <i>NHS Property Services</i>	Support	Soundness - Effective	Productive Landscapes (Option 2)	The CCG supports option 2.	Change	This policy will now be incorporated into the Biodiversity Policy and will require all major developments to incorporate productive landscapes in the design and layout of buildings and landscaping.

Appendix 11

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0080/02/003//C	Mrs Reiko Pepper		Comment			There are areas set out in Appendix 2 through of Appendix 11 where the high risk of pollution through flooding should be highlighted.		No change	Areas at risk of flooding will be highlighted on the Detailed Proposals map.
0116/01/001/Non-specific/C	Mr Andrew Wood		Comment			I am not sure if you are aware but I wanted to alert you to some errors with regard to the policy references in Section 11. The Places of Croydon with the corresponding maps in Appendix 11 as follows: Page 150 Kenley and Old Coulston is listed as Policy DM33 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 34 (the error carries on through the remaining policies); Page 152 Norbury is listed as Policy DM34 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 35; Page 153 Purley is listed as Policy DM35 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 36; Page 155 Sanderstead is listed as Policy DM36 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 37; Page 156 Selsdon is listed as Policy DM37 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 38; Page 157 Shirley is listed as Policy DM38 (it also contains a type with DM 36.3) but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 39; Page 158 South Croydon is listed as Policy DM39 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 40; Page 160 South Norwood and Woodside is listed as Policy DM40 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 41; Page 161 Thornton Heath is listed as Policy DM41 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 42; Page 163 Waddon is listed as Policy DM42 but is illustrated on the maps in Appendix 11 as DM 43.	Map numbers to be corrected in future versions to line up with Policy references.	Change	Policy references on maps will be corrected in the Proposed Submission version of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals.

0120/01/138/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	The western side of the ASPRA area is being developed into shared accommodation in an unplanned piecemeal scenario, where landlords/freeholders are allowed to make a quick kill on property which is attractive because of the transport infrastructure.	No change	Proposed policies on loss of smaller and medium sized homes, restrictions on the net loss of homes with three or more bedrooms, and general character policies all seek to ensure that incremental development is all done to fit with the physical character and built environment of each area. The Council can not actually control how homes are used within the private market as owner occupied and private rental accommodation have to be treated the same way in planning as planning legislation does not differentiate between the two.
0120/01/024/Addiscombe /S	ASPRA	Support	Addiscombe	<p>It can be said that we are very much in favour of the preferred options in the Croydon Local Plans & Proposals, including those for the Addiscombe "Place" or area, and are pleased & impressed by them.</p> <p>It is obvious that a great deal of very intelligent, professional, sensitive & thoughtful work has gone into them, probably from a great number of people, consulting widely. The attention to detail is refreshing, particularly with respect to the retention of historic architectural detail, "lines", levels etc., whereby attractive features are to be retained & enhanced wherever possible, & destruction or detracton from what is good avoided</p> <p>All aspects of the needs for the present day & future seem to have been taken into account wherever possible, but in a very measured way, whereby all is to be carefully planned for the benefit of the community rather than its detriment.</p> <p>Also impressive is the attention paid to heritage, conservation & environmental issues, & the need for pleasant public spaces. Making provision for "public art" is also very important - as this can help to bring an area "to life", providing focus & direction & sense of beauty, "ownership" & "place."</p>	No change	The support is welcomed
0120/01/021/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Looking at the area represented by the ASPRA - the Recreation Ground has been allowed to deteriorate with lack of investment and no restoration of the public toilets.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new facilities in green spaces should be directed to Croydon Council's Environmental and Leisure Services Team.

0120/01/015/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	"ASPRA", Addiscombe & Shirley Park Residents' Association Looking at the area represented by the ASPRA the atmosphere is mainly well built 1900s to 1930s family dwellings with some green space. The roads are tree-lined & peaceful, with a pleasant atmosphere lent by the style of architecture & lay-out, houses set back from the road with front garden areas & good-sized gardens at the back.	No change	The local character of Addiscombe and Shirley were described in paragraphs 11.18, 11.19 and 11.101, 11.102, 11.103 respectively. These should be read in conjunction with the Borough Character Appraisal. Links to the document can be found in Appendix 9, page 255.
0120/01/023/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	There is reduced social cohesion particularly where large properties have been split into one/two bedroom leasehold flats where there is a high turnover of tenants.	No change	The Detailed Policies contains a policy on conversion on small and medium sized homes. In conversions of larger homes there must be no net loss of homes with three or more properties. The Council cannot control the private rental sector through planning as in planning terms it is the same as owner occupied housing.
0120/01/031/Addiscombe /S	ASPRA	Support	Addiscombe	We are now hopeful that Addiscombe & Shirley Park will, along with the rest of Croydon, be emerging into better times & a more promising & prosperous future, and the Croydon Plan & Local Plan have definitely encouraged us to believe that, with the help of the thoughtful, dedicated & hard-working people involved, this will indeed be the case. The Plans seem to promise retention &, wherever possible, enhancement of what is good, & care, quality & appropriateness considered for what is new. After the riots of two years ago, we can be considered to be rising like the proverbial Phoenix from the ashes, in attitude, in aspiration, and in all ways.	No change	
0120/01/017/Addiscombe /S	ASPRA	Support	Addiscombe	The people here like the area & hope that it will not change too much in the coming years. The Croydon Local Plan appears to confirm that this will be the case, and seems to contain a much greater sympathy, understanding & sensitivity to the needs of residents, & strengthens the case for protecting, conserving & enhancing the surroundings & environment than has perhaps been the case in former years.	No change	

0120/01/014/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	<p>We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood: Whitgift Estate RA Whitgift Estate is an area close to the centre of Croydon comprising 323 substantial detached houses built on one third acre plots to a high specification, mostly in the 1930's.</p> <p>This estate was built on land released for development by the Whitgift Foundation and each house has an individual design with no two being the same. The estate fulfils the overall requirement to be an area of 'significant local value- (3.2 of Executive Summary). It is a highly attractive feature of our town consistent with the Council's desire to encourage high net worth individuals to invest and live in the borough.</p>	Add Whitgift Estate to the areas to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local heritage designation.	No change	All representations for proposed local heritage areas put forward during this consultation were reviewed alongside all existing local areas of special character during Summer 2014 against the new heritage-based criteria for Local Heritage Areas set out in paragraph 6.128 of the reasoned justification (called "How the preferred option would work") for policy DM17 of CLP2 (Preferred and Alternative Options). Those areas that meet the criteria will be proposed as new local heritage areas and consulted on in late 2015, accompanied by an evidence base for each proposed local heritage area and reviewed.
0120/01/012/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	<p>We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood: Blackhorse RA We have some members in: Pagehurst, Wydehurst, Sissinghurst, Tenterden, Blackhorse Lane, Teevan, Dalmally and Coniston Roads. Our membership is around 360. The homes are mainly houses, terraced, semis, not very many larger properties. The member are concerned that the outlets in the 'High Street' are losing out to fast food, charity shops, betting shops, and estate agents. In such a small one sided retail area we miss the wider range of opportunity to support local traders, but appreciate the changing habits of shopping on line etc.</p>		No change	Comment noted.
0120/01/025/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Ashburton Park (see also section 10 below) could certainly be improved & be more inviting, perhaps with the addition of a pond or lake for birds & wildlife & general delight.	Improve Ashburton Park with a pond or lake.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new facilities in green spaces should be directed to Croydon Council's Environmental and Leisure Services Team.
0120/01/026/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	There is also the need for more activities & sports in the area, especially for young people.	Provide more activities and sports in the area especially for young people.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new facilities in green spaces should be directed to Croydon Council's Environmental and Leisure Services Team.

0120/01/030/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Local list of buildings or architectural or historic significance:	Add Carlyle Road, Cheyne Walk, Whitethorn Gardens and Ashburton Gardens to the buildings to be reviewed as possibly worthy of local list designation	No change	These recommendations have been noted and will form part of the next review of the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Significance.
				Carlyle Road, Cheyne Walk and Whitethorn Gardens contain fine examples of substantial Edwardian housing that has not in general been sub-divided.			
				Ashburton Avenue contains fine examples of terraced housing with many retaining their period architectural detail. It is in danger of destruction by inappropriate window replacement and loft conversions. Ashburton Avenue was largely built around 1913, & ASPRA have funded an English Heritage "Blue Plaque" commemorating the writer & dramatist, R.F. Delderfield (1912-1972) who lived in the house at No. 22 from 1918 to 1923. He wrote extensively about Addiscombe & Shirley Park, particularly in his series "The Avenue" ("The Avenue Goes to War" & "The Dreaming Suburb") which was later televised. He was a great admirer of suburban life, which seemed to him to combine the best of all worlds, & though Addiscombe was at that time more rural than at present, his books nevertheless provide a flavour of the landscape both of that time & now, when not so very much has changed in the pattern of the pleasant roads & avenues. (The Plaque has not yet been erected). Delderfield himself said that the influence & inspiration of Addiscombe percolated all his works. Colworth Road also has a Plaque commemorating D.H. Lawrence who lived there at one time. Perhaps Addiscombe has an atmosphere that is particularly conducive to writers.			
0120/01/022/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	The lack of car parking space, when large older property is converted into multiple flats, blocks roads and junctions and makes it difficult for service vehicles (e.g. street cleaning, gulley cleaning) to gain The infrastructure therefore deteriorates and there is a general build-up of rubbish. Significant parking blight is caused by commuter parking near Sandilands and Addiscombe tram stops.	Provide more parking, including by transport hubs.	No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for location of new facilities and maintenance of public realm should be directed to Croydon Council's Highways & Parking Team.

0120/01/013/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood:HOME RA The area is vibrant and diverse, with wide road and spaces between properties. The heart of it would be the open space of Mulberry Lane which creates a mews feeling. It has interconnected garden which need to be preserved for help the biodiversity and corridors for the wildlife. This provides the green space that we so lack in the area otherwise.	No change		
0120/01/018/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	<p>Where the Blackhorse Pub was demolished at the junction of Lower Addiscombe Road & Blackhorse Road, a very ugly modern building has been erected, totally out-of-keeping with its surroundings. We have met no-one living here who approves of the modern, multi-coloured building that replaced the historic Blackhorse Pub in Addiscombe village - everybody considers this to be an aberration, an eye-sore, totally out-of-keeping, & an example of their helplessness in the face of an over-riding authority.</p> <p>However, since the re-paving of this area, there is at least a reasonable Public Space on this corner. Ideally, the current Veterinary Practice &/or Tutoring Facility would be replaced by an attractive restaurant/cafe, with awnings & tables outside. However, as things stand, there are some nice benches & a tree, & this area would greatly benefit by the addition of some troughs & baskets of plants & flowers. There was previously an excellent tiered planted flower stand here, but it was removed when the alterations were made recently & not afterwards replaced. Other troughs or baskets of flowers could also be placed along the "village" shopping area of Lower Addiscombe Road, which would greatly benefit from such enhancement, as would the bees & insects etc.</p>	No change	The new, place specific policies are designed to ensure that future development positively responds to the existing character.	
0120/01/136/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	<p>The boundary issues between the 'Addiscombe' area and central Croydon are confused by discrepancies between maps where, for example, the Post Office Sorting centre adjacent to East Croydon station appears to be located in two 'areas'. From a planning perspective the development of a 20 floor tower block of flats on that site fits well with the regime for central Croydon but is inappropriate for 'Addiscombe'. There is a clear lack of infrastructure (schools, medical facilities, open spaces and community centres) and no available land on which to create the infrastructure. So why allow any further development?</p>	Justification for allowing more development queried. No changes proposed.	No change	Planning policies already encourage mixed use developments to enable infrastructure to be provided, in particular Policy SP5 protects existing community facilities and seeks to enable the re-provision of community facilities on sites formerly in this use. The Detailed Proposals element of the Croydon Local Plan will also allocate sites for development of the infrastructure needed to support growth in the borough.

0120/01/137/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Looking at the area represented by the ASPRA the atmosphere is mainly well built and architecturally individual 1900s to 1930s dwellings with generous gardens and some green space. However there is a lack of school or significant medical centre within the boundary.		No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses are provided through Call for Sites' procedure which will be re-launched in February 2014.
0120/01/046/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	Area DM29.2 d) Enhance existing and provide new direct public walking and cycling routes to Addiscombe Railway Park; and from it to Ashburton Park. Question for Council: How? We would appreciate more detail.	Provide more detail on delivery- how will direct public walking and cycling routes be enhanced to Addiscombe Railway Park; and from it to Ashburton Park, and how will new ones be provided?	No change	Policy DM29.2 d facilitates delivery of public realm network through planning application process for future development proposals. Wherever possible the Council and its partners will work with developers to incorporate sections of the route as part of their schemes.
0120/01/045/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Gloucester Road to Morland Road/Cherry Orchard Road. This area probably mostly, but not exclusively, serves residents in our PoC who live around or immediately north, between the Railway lines and Morland Rd. (Davidson Rd, Alexandra Rd, Morland Avenue, Stretton Rd, Leslie Grove, Gordon Crescent etc) but also west of Canning Road. More open engagement with residents and businesses should therefore be expected and hugely beneficial than is evident in either this paper, or the other Town Centre document at present.	More engagement required with residents and businesses is needed for Cherry Orchard Road and Lower Addiscombe Road from Gloucester Road to Morland Road/Cherry Orchard Road.	No change	Comment noted - the Council did provide a specific consultation event for residents and businesses for this area.
0120/01/047/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	Are there plans for the Council to take ownership of the entrance alleyway to the Addiscombe Railway Park from the East India Estate (Council does not currently own this and it is used as (one of) the excuses as to why security to prevent travellers gaining access can't be improved.	Provide dstatement/details of what council is going to do about future ownership of the entrance alleyway to the Addiscombe Railway Park from the East India Estate.	No change	Clarification will be sought as to which entrance to the railway park the comment is referring to.
0120/01/140/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	One fears that within the next 30 years much of the property will be of such low energy efficiency that massive redevelopment of higher density homes will be permitted. By then it may be illegal to own a petrol/diesel powered car, so parking will not be the issue it is today.		No change	

0120/01/135/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	The boundary issues between the 'Addiscombe' area and central Croydon are confused by discrepancies between maps where, for example, the Post Office Sorting centre adjacent to East Croydon station appears to be located in two 'areas'. From a planning perspective the development of a 20 floor tower block of flats on that site fits well with the regime for central Croydon but is inappropriate for 'Addiscombe'. There is a clear lack of infrastructure (schools, medical facilities, open spaces and community centres) and no available land on which to create the infrastructure. So why allow any further development?	Clarify discrepancies between maps of Addiscombe and Central Croydon i.e overlapping of areas.	No change	The Croydon Opportunity Area has a fixed boundary which refers to the Opportunity Area Planning Framework. Boundaries for Places have indicative character and are not related to the physical feature on the ground. Places were adopted as part of Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Planning Policies in 2013.
0120/01/051/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	The Local place of Addiscombe includes Addiscombe Railway Park (Gi) & Addiscombe Recreation Ground (L1) (both included & highlighted in the documents for our meeting) but Addiscombe 'Place' also includes Ashburton Park (G6) & Ashburton Playing Fields.	Add Ashburton Park (G6) & Ashburton Playing Fields. To Addiscombe Place.	No change	It is not possible to fit Addiscombe Place on an A4 landscape sheet at 1:10,000 scale so the Local Green Spaces have not been presented this way. At the Proposed Submission stage all the maps will be combined on an A0 Policies Map so this issue will not arise.
0120/01/139/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Much of the community services are provided by the churches, while the Recreation Ground has been allowed to deteriorate with lack of investment and no restoration of the public toilets.		No change	The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Sugesstions for improvements within green spaces should be directed to Croydon Council's Environmental and Leisure Services Team.
0120/01/052/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	Please provide Green Spaces map for Addiscombe 'Place'.	Please provide Green Spaces map for Addiscombe 'Place'.	No change	Green infrastructure in Addiscombe has been identified in Appendix 9, the map on page 260.
0120/01/019/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Similarly with the Old Library & Pavillion in Ashburton Park - what was once & should be again a glorious public amenity in an attractive & historic setting has been allowed to deteriorate to a sorry state. & the people here have felt powerless to prevent this whilst public authorities apparently wrangled or failed to act. But, at least it is listed, so here the future is hopefully more promising & all not yet lost.		No change	

0120/01/002/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	The sad reality is that Cherry Orchard Road is not a District Centre and only parts of it have ever been designated, and even then only as a Shopping Parade (the part closer to the Leslie Arms). It is fortunate that an element of free half hour parking has been granted in the designated Shopping Parade area, although this is, perhaps, little known and not wholly well demarcated or advertised. The whole of Cherry Orchard Road is unlikely to ever credit District Centre designation, being fragmented and interspersed with housing.		No change	Comment noted.
0120/01/006/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	Addiscombe Place as such is an arbitrary place it is a very diverse area and with mixed social and cultural identity of its residents (from Cherry Orchard Area to Whitgift Area, and in between). This has to be respected and represented in the new document, this is what makes this area vibrant and could make it a great place to live and work.	It is a very diverse area and with mixed social and cultural identity of its residents -this has to be respected and represented in the new document.	No change	The Council will work with ASPRA on how the social and cultural identity of Addiscombe can be further reflected in the Detailed Policies.
0120/01/011/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood: Blackhorse RA We have some members in: Pagehurst, Wydehurst, Sissinghurst, Tenterden, Blackhorse Lane, Teevan, Dalmally and Coniston Roads. Our membership is around 360. The homes are mainly houses, terraced, semis, not very many larger properties. The members want to keep the residential areas as they are (as at the meeting in Croydon) and are concerned that the outlets in the 'High Street' are losing out to fast food, charity shops, betting shops, and estate agents. In such a small one sided retail area we miss the wider range of opportunity to support local traders, but appreciate the changing habits of shopping on line etc.		No change	The new development should positively respond to the existing character, as per general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9 and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). Place specific policies allow for growth whilst respecting, enhancing and complementing the existing character of the area.
0120/01/027/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	We would like trees replaced in places in the residential streets where they have been broken or removed.	Tree replacements needed in residential streets where they have been broken or removed.	No change	Policy 23 addresses the issue of street trees' loss (see paragraph 9.38). Sugesstions for management of green spaces should be directed to Croydon Council's Environmental and Leisure Services Team.

0120/01/008/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	<p>We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood:</p> <p>2.1.Canning & Clyde RA Canning Road and Clyde Road are pleasant suburban streets with a varied streetscape, housing a population of partly transient and partly longer-stay residents, and they form part of the East India Estate Conservation Area. The local architectural jewel is the (Grade II* Listing NGR: TQ3353166011) Church of St Mary Magdalene with St Martin in Canning Road. The adjacent old vicarage is also Grade II Listing NGR: TQ3354066033. Some residents feel Canning Road has been scarred, over the years, by the demolition of houses and the building of blocks of flats. Other residents accept the blocks of flats; for example Edward Jobson Court provides 44 units of sheltered/retirement housing. Canning and Clyde Roads are very green roads with plenty of mature trees which contribute greatly to their character. There are gardens and other green spaces in both roads which we have sometimes been fearful of losing (to the paving over of front gardens and to back garden/infill development).</p>	No change	<p>The description directly refers to East India Conservation Area. Its character has been described in great detail and will be managed through Supplementary Planning Document: the East India Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, which is due for adoption in Spring 2014.</p>	
0120/01/003/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	<p>I have always maintained that the vitality of Cherry Orchard Road lies firmly with the regeneration of the East Croydon end of the road; without which I fear the Cherry Orchard Road shopping parade will continue to become increasingly isolated and fragile.</p>	No change	<p>The Southern section of Cherry Orchard Road is included in the Croydon Opportunity Area Planning Framework and East Croydon Masterplan. Both documents encourage regeneration of this part of Croydon.</p>	
0120/01/141/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	<p>No, the preferred policy approach is not deliverable. It is not a natural 'area' and is an attempt to define a community that does not in reality exist. It will be an administrative functionality that contradicts the ward boundaries and will disenfranchise the residents.</p>	Review and amend the Places' boundaries.	No change	<p>The general concept and broad areas of the Places were originally set out and subject to public consultation as part of the preparation of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies. Tweaks to boundaries are possible as part of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies but not the concept itself as the Detailed Policies legally have to be in conformity with the Strategic Policies.</p>

0120/01/005/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	<p>Within the parameters of the Croydon Opportunity Area it may be considered that the presence of a semi-industrial use is not wholly beneficial.</p> <p>Specifically, the Cherryfield Meatpackers site seems wholly inappropriate and is known to cause traffic disruption throughout the day on Cherry Orchard Road when large lorries park outside while loading and unloading and also when reversing or turning into the site. Additionally, local residents often experience night-time disturbance from noisy refrigerated lorries being parked over night in either Cherry Orchard Road or Cross Road while waiting for the site to open in the morning (this, unfortunately, as a result of bollards being placed outside the premises and alongside at Acorn House to prevent night-time parking). There are presumably more appropriate locations within the Borough for Cherryfield to operate from and their current location may be better used for a mixed use retail/office/residential development which would both enhance the Croydon opportunity Area and Cherry Orchard Road itself.</p>	No change	<p>The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses are provided through Call for Sites' procedure which will be re-launched in February 2014.</p>	
0120/01/004/Addiscombe /C	ASPRA	Comment	Addiscombe	<p>The overlap of Addiscombe and the Croydon Opportunity Area is well conceived. The pragmatic view has to take into account that that area already consists of tall buildings, including the Royal Mail sorting Office, Knollys House, Stephenson House, Quest House, Galaxy House, Cumberland Court and, of course, a mainline railway station and has, since 2006, been designated as an area suitable for very tall buildings, giving rise to the consented Menta development. It is worth considering, however, that the demarcation of the Croydon Opportunity Area firmly establishes what may be permissible in that area only, as distinct from the rest of Addiscombe as a whole.</p>	<p>It is worth considering, however, that the demarcation of the Croydon Opportunity Area firmly establishes what may be permissible in that area only, as distinct from the rest of Addiscombe as a whole. Make this clearer in the Place of Addiscombe.</p>	No change	
0095/01/005/Coulsdon/C	Mr Christopher Butler	Comment	Coulsdon	<p>At the same time we need action on the Red Lion site in Coulsdon which is at the heart of the shopping area but has stood derelict of over 10 years.</p>	<p>Need action on the Red Lion site in Coulsdon</p>	No change	<p>Applications for specific sites do not form part of the Croydon Local Plan - Detailed Policies. The Red Lion site in Coulsdon is currently a subject of planning application. Any comments can submitted through the statutory planning consultation process.</p>

0095/01/001/Purley/C	Mr Christopher Butler	Comment	Purley	During the last 50 years I have seen the town of Purley go steadily downhill. Good shops have disappeared and the traffic has increased to unmanageable proportions. Parking is difficult to the point where you are forced to use Tesco stores for shopping at the exclusion of other more friendly or suitable specialist shops which, in consequence, struggle for survival.		No change	Comment noted.
0095/01/003/Purley/C	Mr Christopher Butler	Comment	Purley	The swimming pool and leisure facilities are important features which are needed by young people living in the area. However these buildings are old and need to be replaced with a much larger social centre building to form a focal point for the town.	The swimming pool and leisure facilities are important features which need to be replaced with a much larger social centre building to form a focal point for the town.	Change	The Council is undertaking a borough-wide 'Indoor Sports and Outdoor Recreation Needs Assessment' and this will include an assessment of Purley Pool. As stated at the Local Plan (Core Strategy) Examination, this site will be considered as part of the 'Call for Sites' exercise and will be informed by the findings of the Needs Assessment and any representations received. The preferred uses for the site will be set out in the Detailed Proposals part of the Croydon Local Plan Detailed Policies and Proposals Development Plan Document. It is envisaged that this part of the Local Plan will be consulted upon later this year. Policy DM18.2 (b), will be reviewed to ensure it does not have the unintended consequence of removing the protection for a community facility at Purley Pool.
0095/01/004/Purley/C	Mr Christopher Butler	Comment	Purley	What seems to be lacking is a properly thought out local plan. I recommend one is commissioned by Croydon Council to be produced by June 2014, approved by the end of the year and Phase 1 (possibly traffic improvements) commenced during 2015. It is likely that a proportion of costs could be met by private investors if they could see that new buildings had proper civic	Local plan for Purley required.	No change	Consideration will be given to the benefits of preparing a masterplan for Purley District Centre. The option is also available for the community to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan.
0095/01/002/Purley/C	Mr Christopher Butler	Comment	Purley	Some restaurants exist in the High Street- and they must be encouraged.	Encourage restaurants in Purley High Street.	No change	The extent of the Secondary Retail Frontage in Purley allows for the change of use to A3 use and this supports the establishment of new restaurants.
0121/01/032/Purley/O	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Object	Purley	Indicative extent of potential masterplan is NOT shown (yellow hatchings).	Show a potential masterplan on the Purley map.	No change	No masterplan is proposed for Purley. The key is a standard key for each of the Places maps, some of which do show a potential masterplan.

0121/01/033/Purley/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA	Comment	Purley	Is the boundary DM36.1 correct?	Clarify if the boundary of DM36.1 is correct. No change	No change	The boundaries as indicated on the Proposals Map show the extent of the district centre designation whilst the map on page 320 refers to the place specific character management policy. Hence the difference in their boundaries.
0105/01/055/Shirley/O	Monks Orchard Residents Associa	Object	Shirley	Add paragraph 11.05 as follows A map showing the areas of monks Orchard in which Policy DM38.5 can be found in Appendix 11. And add an additional map of MORA Area	Add paragraph 11.05 as follows A map showing the areas of monks Orchard in which Policy DM38.5 can be found in Appendix 11. And add an additional map of MORA Area	No change	There is no place specific policy required for Monks Orchard. Its character is highly consistent and therefore is sufficiently protected by general planning policies of Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies DM11 through to DM 17.9, and National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 7, in particular paragraph 58) and the London Plan (Chapter 7). Therefore no change to the map is required.
0120/01/010/Addiscombe/O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood: PARK HILL RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION We list how residents see their immediate neighbourhood: Park Hill Residents Association represents people living in East Croydon. Our boundaries run along Addiscombe Road, down Radcliffe Road and across Lloyd Park to Coombe Road and from Coombe Road along the railway line to East Croydon station. There are about 2,600 households in the area and about 450 of these currently belong to the Association. LANDMARKS & VIEWS: Lloyd Park Park Hill Recreation Ground especially the Water Tower The triangle of open space off Cotelands by Park Hill Infants School St Matthew's Church St Bernard's conservation area in Chichester Road	Add Lloyd Park , Park Hill Recreation Ground especially the Water Tower, The triangle of open space off Cotelands by Park Hill Infants School, St Matthew's Church, St Bernard's conservation area in Chichester Road to the Views and Landmarks in Table 6.1	No change	The Council reviewed these proposals for Designated Local Landmarks against the assessment criteria accompanying the proposed policy for Views and Landmarks of the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options). These suggested landmarks do not meet the criteria. Further evidence of the assessment of suggested panoramas, views and landmarks identifying those that meet the criteria will be published alongside the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Preferred and Alternative Options).
0080/02/005/Kenley & Old Coulsdon/C	Mrs Reiko Pepper	Comment	Kenley & Old Coulsdon	DM33 is wrongly referred to as DM 34 in map on page 318. Plus, Flood Zone 3 should be shown.		Change	Drawing on page 318: DM34 will be changed to DM33 to address the issue. The purpose of the map on page 318 is to identify areas where place specific policies apply. For clarity no other information is included.

Appendix 2

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0126/01/009/Non-specific/C	Claire O'Donovan Merton Council		Comment			Cannot determine potential cross-boundary impacts of development as there is no certainty what future uses may be proposed on the sites. More information is required for the site allocation policies to set out clearly what is and is not permitted within the allocated areas, subject to an appropriate evidence base. Could be addressed by linking all the areas to the relevant policies to accommodate growth or by indicating that these issues will be dealt with further in Area Action Plans, SPDs or Masterplans.	Add further information to set out what development is and what is not permitted within the allocated areas.	No change	The forthcoming Detailed Proposals part of this DPD will address site allocations.
0126/01/005/Beulah Road/C	Claire O'Donovan Merton Council		Comment		Beulah Road	Unclear what evidence is used to justify the re-designation of this designated shopping parade to be designated as a local centre. The shopping parade designation sufficiently protect the retail services and facilities provided at Beulah Road to meet residents' day-to-day needs. No clear proposals as to what the Council intends to happen in this location, for example does the council intend for more retail services and facilities to be developed in this location which consequently may result in this area growing to District/Major town centre status. Concerned over the cumulative impact on the vitality and viability of Merton's designated town centres, particularly combined with redevelopment of the Whitgift Centre and the findings of the GLA's experian consumer expenditure and comparison goods floorspace need in London.	Provide details on the evidence used to justify the new designation and what the council intends to happen in the local centre.	No change	Appendix 4 sets out the reasons for designating this area as a Local Centre. It is unlikely it will ever meet the criteria for District Centre status and is therefore unlikely to have any detrimental effect on Merton's town centres.
0126/01/002/Norbury/C	Claire O'Donovan Merton Council		Comment		Norbury	The same boundary lines should be used for town centres in appendix 1-6 and for appendix 11. In Appendix 2, Norbury District Centre is proposed to be reduced but this is represented by the old boundary in Appendix 11. This would cause confusion as it appears the council would be encouraging commercial growth edge-of-centre and out-of-centre which is discouraged by National and Regional Policy and Guidance.	Use the same boundary lines for the maps in appendix 1-6 and the maps in appendix 11.	Change	Boundaries were amended to reflect on changes to character management policies.
0121/01/029/Purley/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA		Comment		Purley	Re Purley , page 174, The blue colour on the map appears to go into the railway lines- why?	Clarify the map pm page 174 and why the blue colour appears to go into the railway lines	No change	The extent of the District Centre intentionally includes the main station buildings as these are acceptable locations for retail activity.

0121/01/028/Purley/S	Tarsem Flora <i>PWRA</i>	Support		Purley	Agree with the boundary change to the District Centre.		Welcome support	None
0101/01/023/Shirley/O	Lesley Godden <i>Shirley Planning Forum</i>	Object	Soundness - Effective	Shirley	Accept the rationale for the amendments to the boundary of the Local Centre and Primary Shopping Area in relation to Shirley Library, the Hartland Way Surgery and the properties in Westway Gardens as well as the removal of the Shopping Area Frontage designation to the thatched cottage at 190 Wickham Road. However, feel that all the remaining retail premises in the Local Centre should be designated as Main Retail Frontage, including the lighting shop at 163 Wickham Road in order to prevent a loss of retail units in the Local Centre.	Designate the remaining retail premises in the Local Centre as a Main Retail Frontage.	No change	Considering the size of the Local Centre, the amount of premises afforded protection by the Main Retail Frontage designation is extensive. Further expansion of this frontage could undermine the Centre's ability to react to changing shopping patterns, economic cycles etc.

Appendix 4

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0115/01/009/Non-specific/O	Mr Bob Sleeman		Object			In Addiscombe the two major parades should be listed and protected. Small parades exist in two places in Shirley Road but these are not listed and merit similar protection.	Two major shopping parades as well as smaller parades on Shirley Road should be protected.	Change	54-74 Shirley Road will be designated as a Shopping Parade

Appendix 6

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0126/01/003/Map 3/C	Claire O'Donovan Merton Council		Comment		Map 3	Wants more detail on what elements of this Panorama are considered valuable and protectable and what kind of development would be intrusive to it because Moat Housing is in the early stages of developing regeneration concepts for the Pollards Hill Housing Estate.	Include detail on which elements of this panorama are considered to be valuable and protectable, and any details of what types of development would be intrusive to it.	Change	Views outside the borough are not considered as part of the reason for designation as the Council has no control over development proposals beyond the borough boundary. However all the Panoramas proposed for inclusion in the Croydon Local Plan will list the key features within the Panoramas in the next stage of the Croydon Local Plan:Detailed Policies.

Appendix 7

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0107/01/009/Non-specific/C	David Harmes Chase Residents Association		Comment			Appendix 7 - Proposed Local Green Spaces:- 'A full list of sites considered for designation including those sites that did not meet the criteria above can be found at www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/lpevidence/nature .' Comment: If you copy & paste this it doesn't work because of the unintended space - Council should correct in future publications.	Council to correct this link to evidence in the future or explain how to access evidence.	No change	The issues only affect the documents available to download from the Council's Cabinet webpage. The final consultation documents on the Croydon Local Plan page do not have this issue.
0120/01/058/Non-specific/C	ASPRA		Comment			Appendix 7 Proposed Local Green Spaces:- 'A full list of sites considered for designation including those sites that did not meet the criteria above can be found at www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/lpevidence/nature .' Comment: If you copy & paste this it doesn't work because of the unintended space Council should correct in future publications. It should be: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/lpevidence/nature [See email exchange ASPRA and Dominick Mennie 06Dec13 relates to pre-publication version of PDF document.]	Appendix 7 weblink to full list - Council should correct in future publications. It should be: http://www.croydon.gov.uk/planningandregeneration/framework/lpevidence/nature	No change	The issues only affect the documents available to download from the Council's Cabinet webpage. The final consultation documents on the Croydon Local Plan page do not have this issue.

Appendix 8

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0121/01/030/Non-specific/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA		Comment		Minor extension to Metropolitan Green Spaces. This may be the right moment to correct the boundary of MOL at Purley Way. I have drawn council's attention to this before. The MOL currently seems to extend over the part of the site currently occupied by LA Fitness and another building (ref map published in the Unitary Development Plan grid ref. 310/340 amd 640).	Propose a minor extension to current MOL/Metropolitan Green Spaces.	No change	The extensions were proposed to maintain protection on sites that do not meet the criteria for Local Green Space.

Appendix 9

<i>Ref No</i>	<i>Representor Company or Organisation</i>	<i>Participation at EIP</i>	<i>Object or Support</i>	<i>Soundness</i>	<i>Policy or Paragraph</i>	<i>Summary of Representation</i>	<i>Summary of Proposed Changes</i>	<i>Council's Response</i>	<i>Council's Proposed Action</i>
0121/01/031/Non-specific/C	Tarsem Flora PWRA		Comment			All the maps shown can be improved. (Why is there a thick line around each area??)	Improve the Maps to Appendix 9 and clarify why the thisck line round each area.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 will be overlaid with street map. Line thicknesses will be reviewed.
0115/01/014/Addiscombe /O	Mr Bob Sleeman		Object		Addiscombe	The flats adjacent to St Mildred's are shown as mixed type flats but are actually retirement homes. Questions what mixed type flat means. In Ashburton Avenue there seems to be a mix of this type of flats and large houses on relatively small plots, but many of these are actually flats.	Defintion required of mixed-type flats. Some areas should be designated as retirement homes or as flats when they are designated as mixed-type flats or large houses on small plots.	No change	Residential character is defined in the wider context by buildings and surrounding land including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc.. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page
0115/01/015/Addiscombe /O	Mr Bob Sleeman		Object		Addiscombe	No planning clarity and the plan/map must go back to the drawing board. There would be more benefit in a plan that shows in some detail by street the type of residential property that makes up the defined types in the key. This would identify densities and would indicate where there is capacity for higher density housing and the related requirement for infrastructure.	Map should be redone to provide greater clarity and to show where there is capacity for higher density housing.	Change	Maps in Appendix 9 will be overlaid with street map.
0115/01/013/Addiscombe /O	Mr Bob Sleeman		Object		Addiscombe	The Scout Hut on Craven Road, St Mary Magalene Church on Canning Road and Methodist Church in Lower Addiscombe Road is not marked or is not correct. The key does not include the checkerboard pattern.	The Scout Hut on Craven Road, St Mary Magalene Church on Canning Road and Methodist Church in Lower Addiscombe Road should be marked in correct locations and key should include all patterns.	Change	Local character is defined in the wider context by buildings and surrounding land including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc.. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page 255 and non-residential character typologies are included in Appendix 10, page 289. A singular building on a small plot does not constitute the predominant character of the area. The following change will be made to the map: - St Mary Magalene Church on Canning Road will be marked as 'large building in an urban setting'

0120/01/119/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	The current version is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to 'agree'. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. It is not at all clear what the fourth area to the south of Bingham Road is.	Clarify what the fourth area to the south of Bingham Road is on the map on page 260.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. The fourth area of 'institutions with associated grounds' in Bingham Road area refers to the Hall inside the block of streets: Bingham Road, Craven Road, Ashburton Avenue and Compton Road.
0120/01/126/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to 'agree'. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. In Ashburton Avenue there seems to be a mix of these pink flats and mauve 'large houses' on relatively small plots -many of which are actually split in flats which are indeed very 'mixed'.	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify 'mixed type flats'.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. Local character is defined in the wider context by buildings and surrounding land including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page
0120/01/127/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to 'agree'. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. If this lack of clarity is allowed across the whole of Addiscombe (and indeed the whole of Croydon) there is no planning clarity at all.	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Provide clarity to the map for Addiscombe.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map.
0120/01/121/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to 'agree'. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. St Mary Magdalene Church in Canning Road is not marked	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify why the St. Mary Magdalene Church in Canning Road is not marked.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. St Mary Magdalene Church in Canning Road will be marked as 'large building in an urban setting'.

0120/01/124/Addiscombe /O	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to `agree`. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. The checkerboard areas close to the Methodist church are I assume Harris & Bailey and the Tesco Petrol station, but what is the third small one? The key does not appear to include that pattern.	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify the checkerboard areas close to the Methodist church are Harris & Bailey and the Tesco Petrol station, and what the third small one is. The key to the map on page 260 does not appear to include the pattern.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. The hatched area west to the Methodist Church is character type called 'industrial estates' described to a greater detail in Appendix 10, pages 299-300. The red colour refers to the building No 32b Canning Road, which will be amended to purple. 'large houses on relatively small plots' as is the predominant character in this location
0120/01/122/Addiscombe /O	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to `agree`. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. The Methodist Church in Lower Addiscombe Road looks an odd shape	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify why the Methodist Church in Lower Addiscombe Road looks an odd shape.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map.
0120/01/125/Addiscombe /O	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to `agree`. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. The flats adjacent to St Mildred's are shown as `mixed type flats` but they are actually designed and sold as retirement homes- whatever does `mixed type flats` mean ?	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify what `mixed type flat` means.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. Local character is defined in the wider context by buildings and surrounding land including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page
0120/01/118/Addiscombe /O	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to `agree`. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose For example it seems to show the St Mildred's site as an institution with associated grounds, this probably relates to the Roman Catholic Church in Bingham Road and the small chapel also on Bingham Road.	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify if St. Mildred's site as an institution with associated grounds, and if this classification relates to the Roman Catholic Church in Bingham Road and the small chapel also on Bingham Road.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. Properties: St Mildred's site, Roman Catholic Church of Our Lady of the Annunciation and a small chapel (Christians in Action Church) on Bingham Road are classified as 'institutions with associated grounds'. For detailed information about this type of non-residential character see Appendix 10, page 301-302.

0120/01/123/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to 'agree'. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. What is the significance of the red line running to the east of the Methodist church in Lower Addiscombe Road?	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify what is the significance of the red line running to the east of the Methodist church in Lower Addiscombe Road?	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. The red colour refers to the buuilding No 32b Canning Road, which will be amended to purple: 'large houses on relatively small plots' as is the predominant character in this location.
0120/01/120/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to 'agree'. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose. The Scout hut in Craven Road is not marked.	Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified. Clarify why the Scout Hut in Craven Road is not marked.	Change	All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map. With regard to the Scouts' Hut, local character is defined in the wider context by buildings and surrounding land including street layout, landscape, distance between the buildings etc.. References to detailed information about Croydon's residential character and character types can be found in Appendix 9, page 255 and non-residential character typologies are included in Appendix 10, page 289. A singular building on a small plot does not constitute the predominant character of the area.

The preferred policy approach is not the most appropriate for Croydon to help us meet our Strategic Objectives set out in Section 3. The description of Purley omits mention of one of the most important assets within Purley, that contributes greatly to the footfall and vitality of Purley centre and needs to be recognised within the plan as important and worthy of protection. Namely Purley Swimming Pool and Gymnasium. Deliverable but not sustainable without a key purpose, not enabling sustainable development. Without some features that attract visitors to Purley the shopping centre is unlikely to be sustainable as it is probably below critical mass and the default shopping area in the locality is likely to be Coulsdon. The Purley Pool and Gymnasium attracts many hundreds of visitors a month and is a major contributor to the vitality of the centre. It needs to be recognised and protected within the plan as it has been the subject of previous attempts to close it.

I am a user of the pool for early morning swimming several times a week. I walk to and from the pool and the exercise of that walking and swimming forms a major part of my fitness regime, now that I am retired. I also regularly bring my grandchildren to the pool and they have learnt to swim there. These visits mean that I use a local pharmacy, local newsagent, local bank in Purley and I recently spent a large sum in a carpet shop in Purley, because in walking past on my way to swimming I noticed that they seemed to have what I wanted. I am aware that many other users of the pool use facilities in Purley as a by-product of their visits, including cafes and restaurants, one informal group I know regularly organises evening out in Purley as an adjunct to their aqua aerobics. These features are in my opinion crucial to retaining the vibrancy of Purley and the Pool needs to be protected by mention in the plan

Add description of Purley pool and gymnasium .Purley and the Pool needs to be protected by mention in the plan.

No change

The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses are provided through Call for Sites' procedure which will be re-launched in February 2014.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development and positive response to wider growth opportunities are embedded in current national planning policies. Policy DM35.1 allow for growth whilst respecting, enhance and complement existing character of Purley Town Centre.

0120/01/130/Non-specific/O	ASPRA	Object	<p>There may be more benefit in a plan that shows, in some detail street by street, the type of residential property that makes up the defined types in the key in appendix 9. That way we might identify the density of one, two, three bedroom flats, terraced houses and larger properties not subdivided into flats by location. This could indicate where there is capacity for higher density housing and the related requirement for infrastructure (schools, open spaces, health clinics, shops, transport etc.).</p>	<p>Disagree with Place specif policy approach concentrating on areas that are not consistent. Require more detail in Appendix 9 maps to identify residential types at a street by street level.</p>	No change	<p>The place specific policies are designed to manage the local character. Opportunities to suggest location of particular facilities or types of uses are provided through Call for Sites' procedure which will be re-launched in February 2014.</p>	
0120/01/117/Addiscombe /O	ASPRA	Object	Addiscombe	<p>No, the preferred policy approach of DM27.1 does not enable sustainable development. Reason:-The current version- Map of Addiscombe on page 260 is not in enough detail to properly identify the exact locations and therefore is impossible to `agree`. The use of colour shades that are indistinct and are not overlaid with a road network as shown below is not fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Amend map on page 260 with clearer graphics to enable exact locations to be identified.</p>	Change	<p>All maps in Appendix 9 has been overlaid with street map.</p>