

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 31st January 2019

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1- 18/05009/FUL – 55 SELCROFT ROAD, CR8 1AJ

Drawings Numbers:

The drawing 32-P- 8 Rev B has been replaced with 32-P-8 Rev C to correct a drawing inconsistency in regards to the rear dormer on the rear addition.

Drawing 32-P-16 Rev B added which shows design of lower ground floor lightwells.

To date the council have received 75 objections to the application.

The following additional issues from those reported in the committee report were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

- The addition of balconies in the revised application add to the massing of the development and are wholly inappropriate in an urban area. No houses in the area have balconies.

[OFFICER COMMENT: The terraces have been appropriately integrated into the design of the development, and have appropriate traditional black painted metal balustrades. They are not considered to cause harm to the appearance of the development, site, or surrounding context and street scene.]

- The published committee report states that parking stress will be 29%, but this does not affect the reality that the junction of Selcroft Road, Purley Hill and Oakwood Avenue will be saturated with parked cars.

[OFFICER COMMENT: The level of parking stress is low, and as such cars will be able to park safely within reasonable radius of their homes.]

The following procedural issues were raised in representations, and are addressed below:

- The public consultation period on the revised drawings that included balconies and terraces had not finished by the time the officer's recommendation on the committee report had been published. The council are rushing through the application and not following due process.

[OFFICER COMMENT: The public consultation on the revised drawings expired on the Monday 28th January 2019. Any additional comments received between the publishing of the officer report on the 22nd January and the end of the formal consultation period have been reported through this addendum. The comments received have not changed the recommendation, nor significantly the contents of the Officer's report. It is not considered that neighbours have unduly been prejudiced, with Committee fully informed at the point of decision.]

Item 6.2- 18/05787/FUL – 76 Reddown Road, CR5 1AL

The council have received an additional three objections. Additional points, not already covered by the case officer's reports raised in objections in relation to:

- The proposed footprint will stretch the entire width of the plot. [*Officer comment: The proposed building is set in from both flank boundaries*].
- The roofline proposed is 1.5m higher than the surrounding properties and given that a loft conversion at 26 Reddown Road that required less extra elevation than this was refused, would suggest that common sense will prevail in this instance in regards to this proposed development. [*Officer comment: Each application is judged on its own merits and therefore any decision relating to a loft conversion at 26 Reddown Road is not material to the application to be considered at 76 Reddown Road*].
- The tree in the front garden of 76 Reddown Road was removed at the cost of the developer which seems odd considering planning has not yet been granted. [*Officer comment: the details of who paid for the removal of the tree, highlighted throughout the case officers report, are not a material consideration to this application*].
- No council representatives attended the meeting with ECRA and the developer. [*Officer comment: representatives of the council were not invited to any such meeting*].
- Great concern that an initial proposal with less bedrooms, more parking spaces and better design were refused by the Council in favour of the existing proposal. [*Officer comment: The applications has gone through many iterations, however the initial pre-app proposed a building approximately double the size, with more bedrooms than the application now for consideration*].
- The proposed balconies are likely, if not almost certain to be used for stage, smoking, and noise, totally out of keeping with the surrounding area. [*Officer Comment: The balconies are considered to be well designed, providing external private amenity areas for future occupiers whilst being enclosed and restricting views to the front and rear of the site. As they will be used for a residential use, in a residential area, overall there is not considered to be any undue harm caused owing to noise*].

Following the additional objections and clarifications the proposed number of notifications received should read:

6.1 The application has been publicised by 5 letters of notification to neighbouring properties in the vicinity of the application site.

No of individual responses: 145	Objecting: 112	Supporting:33	Comment:0
No of individual responses: 1	Objecting: 1	Supporting:0	Comment: 0

It has also been noted that figure 2 highlighted within the case officers report is annotated incorrectly. This should read Figure 2: Proposed Front (bottom) and Rear (top) Elevation Streetscene.