

22nd October Planning Committee Addendum

Item 5.1 – 20/00549/PRE - 922-930 Purley Way

As an update since the officer report was published, the scheme has now been to Place Review Panel for the second time. A summary of the key verbal points raised and highlighted by the panel is included below:

- The Panel agree that Blocks B and C are working more successfully than Block A at present.
- It is recommended to reconsider the overall massing strategy; exploring a transitional height of 12-8-6 storeys. Block A's footprint should have a straight up extrusion with no horizontal split to the massing as this will emphasize its strong form and corner condition.
- The Panel reiterated the Block A will need to be of exceptional architectural quality in order to justify its height. The scheme should aspire to match the quality of architecture of Purley Baptist Church.
- The Panel are not convinced that the vertical splits and contrasting brick tones are helpful in breaking up the massing. More subtle alternatives should be tested.
- Further work is needed regarding the base, middle and top articulation, and how this relates to the character of Purley.
- The Panel are broadly happy with the emerging landscape design; however they highlighted that making the play space publically accessible would "give back" to the existing residents of Purley.
- The Panel encouraged the Applicant to further consider the interface between architecture and landscape and how this could be enhanced to strengthen the relationship between these two elements of the proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank

22nd October Planning Committee Addendum

Item 6.1 – 20/001145/FUL - Land rear of 19 Grasmere Road

Paragraph 8.13 should be revised to:

8.13 The assessment also concluded that all but four bedrooms would meet the targets for annual and winter sunlight. Two of these bedrooms would be single-aspect north-facing rooms on the ground floor (F00/R4 and F00/R5). The combined factors of ground-floor accommodation and a north-orientation would present a challenge in achieving the targets for sunlight. However, the layout of these units have been configured so that the main living accommodation would face south and benefit from excellent sunlight amenity. The remaining two bedrooms would be Flats 5 and 6 (F01/R3 and F01/R5) which would sit beneath the balconies at first floor. These two rooms would benefit from direct access to the private balconies and the main habitable rooms for these units would benefit from excellent levels of sunlight throughout the year. On balance, considering that sunlight levels to the habitable rooms would be acceptable, the main use of bedrooms for sleeping, site and design constraints, the level of sunlight received for all units would be acceptable.

A new paragraph should be inserted after 8.13 as:

8.14 All ground floor units would have a private accessible rear garden amenity space and the upper floor flats would all have front balcony areas. Within the scheme, the shared amenity space including play space will meet the recommendations within BRE Guidelines, so will receive at least two hours of direct sunlight to at least 50% of the area on 21st March. In terms of the gardens serving flats 2 and 3, these will not meet the 2 hours of direct sunlight to at 50% of the area on 21st March because they are located immediately to the north. However, these units also have access to the shared communal spaces and so is on balance acceptable. These amenity spaces would exceed the minimal space standards contained within the London Plan Housing SPG. Officers note the proximity of some trees to some of the private amenity spaces, but are considered on balance acceptable.

A new paragraph should be inserted after 8.23 as:

8.24 In terms of overshadowing to neighbouring properties, those to the north and west will comply with the BRE Guidelines by achieving at least two hours of direct sunlight to at least 50% of the area on 21st March. Where the value is less than 50% in the existing scenario (rear garden of 325 Portland Road), the reduction is less than 20% and therefore unlikely to be noticeable.

Item 6.2 – 20/01483/FUL - Land And Garages Rear Of 9-29 Crystal Terrace

Since the publication of the report, one additional representation objecting to the scheme was received. Issues raised have already been covered in the report.

Item 6.3 – 20/02280/FUL - 39 Pampisford Road

The unit mix for the development is 3 x 3 bedroom, 3 x 2 bedroom (4 person), 2 x 2 bedroom (3 person) and 1 x 1 bedroom flats. Paragraph 3.1 should be corrected accordingly.

As per paragraph 3.7 of the officer report, planning consent has been granted at the neighbouring site (37 Pampisford Road) for a flatted development. By way of an update, this property has now been demolished in pursuance of this planning consent.

A correction is required in paragraph 8.18:

The three remaining ground floor units would have step free access to entrances and could be adapted to become building regulations M4(2) compliant if required.

Since the publication of the report, one additional representation objecting to the scheme was received. Issues raised have already been covered in the report, aside from the following points:

- Reduction in surrounding property values [OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration)
- Overdevelopment of Purley for maximising Council tax revenues [OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration]

Item 6.4 – 20/03291/FUL – 59 Upper Shirley Road

Paragraph 2.1 of the report is corrected as follows (to indicate correct location for monies to be spent):

2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the completion of a Legal Agreement (S106 or Unilateral Undertaking) to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £3,737.50 towards highway management measures and the delivery of sustainable transport initiatives including car club, EVCP, improved cycle infrastructure in and around Upper Shirley Road and neighbouring streets.

Since the publication of the report, an additional 9 representations from one resident have been received. Issues covered have already been raised and are detailed in the report or are non-material planning issues, aside from the following points:

- Error in paragraph 2.1 of the report [OFFICER COMMENT: This has now been corrected]
- Parking stress surveys are not available for residents to view [OFFICER COMMENT: The parking stress surveys are available to view online and have been since the application was validated]
- Comments relating to the developer/applicant [OFFICER COMMENT: This is not relevant to the decision nor is a material planning consideration]

- The neighbouring ground floor window at 44 Postmill Close serves a living room and this isn't covered in the report [OFFICER COMMENT: whilst the officer report does not specifically state this is a living room, paragraph 8.23 refers to this window which faces towards the site. There would be a separation distance of approx. 10.5m with the flank of the development to the north of the dwelling, which, whilst it is acknowledged the proposed building is larger in scale, is only marginally closer (approx. 0.5m) than the relationship with the existing building. As set out in the report, the main outlook for this property is to the east and south where the garden is located, and obscure glazing is proposed where necessary to ensure there is no loss of privacy. Taking these factors into account, along with the similarities in terms of massing to the scheme already granted, the impact on this neighbouring occupiers is considered acceptable.

This page is intentionally left blank