

## Planning Committee

Meeting of Croydon Council's Planning Committee held virtually on Thursday, 17 December 2020 at 7:30pm via Microsoft Teams

This meeting was Webcast – and is available to view via the Council's Web Site

## MINUTES

**Present:** Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Vice-Chair);

Councillors Clive Fraser, Lynne Hale, Toni Letts, Ian Parker, Paul Scott, Jamie Audsley (In place of Chris Clark), Pat Clouder (In place of Joy Prince), Michael Neal (In place of Gareth Streeter) and Helen Pollard (In place of Scott Roche)

**Also Present:** Councillor Simon Brew

## PART A

### 292/20 Minutes of Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 3 December 2020 be signed as a correct record with the following amendments:

To record the change in Chair during the meeting, from Councillor Chris Clark to Vice Chair, Councillor Ben-Hassel.

In reference to Item 19/04661/FUL 34 Brownlow Road, Croydon, CR0 5JT, comments made by Councillor Paul Scott suggesting that one parking space on the site was a very low amount, and that parking permits should not be restricted, that there was enough bays for residents to have their own parking provision on site and therefore to allow residents to access parking permits.

### 293/20 Disclosure of Interest

Councillor Pat Clouder disclosed for transparency in relation to item 20/01658/FUL 36 Oakwood Avenue, Purley, CR8 1AQ that she is a long-term customer at the cattery.

### 294/20 Urgent Business (if any)

There was none.

295/20 **Development presentations**

296/20 **19/05846/PRE 2 Bensham Lane, CR0 2RQ**

Demolition of existing single storey commercial building and construction of mixed development of commercial/residential use in a single block a maximum of 11 storey in height to provide 60 new homes and ground floor commercial floor space with alterations associated landscaping, new highway access and car/cycle parking as well as bin storage.

Ward: Broad Green

Richard Hyams, Matt Arnold and Ana Lopes attended to give a presentation and respond to Members' questions and issues raised for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application.

The main issues raised at this meeting were as follows:

- Comments were raised by Members relating to the commercial elements on the ground floor with concerns of the unit being empty, and the applicants informed that they would be seeking a community use to the market which will provide a flexible space. Members supported the commercial/community use and the rationale for it, particularly in support for a nursery provision. There was a request for how the nursery provision would work with the open space which is provided for young people.
- Members expressed concerns regarding the materials and how they might appear in on a winter day, the applicants informed that the materials was appropriate for all seasons.
- A Member had questions around the shading effect of the building.
- Open space and play provision within the scheme was discussed and Members would like the focus to remain within the afford element.
- There was indication from Members to explore the play and communal space design further and whether it was publicly accessible. The applicants explained the different areas for different ages and further explained the opportunity of sharing space with the neighbouring development, with the ground floor to be a play space for different ages and the terrace to be a more general use.
- Members raised concerns with how the servicing of the building was to run.
- There was concerns from Members for the concept of a pocket park at the front of the building, the execution of it and the design, and also accommodating provision for disabled parking spaces.

- Comments from Members were raised in relation to the privacy on the balconies, there was a suggestion for storage on the balconies as part of the design.
- There were mixed views by Members on the height and place specific policy, some Members expressed support on the increased height against the policy due to the affordable housing offer, other Members expressed their concern about the height and that policy should be adhered to in regardless to the affordable offer as it was not justified.
- Members raised comments about the design of having a top middle and bottom expression was working in particular with regards to the balconies.
- There was support for the 10% accessible units, though there was a steer from Members that the opportunity to increase that provision should be explored.
- There were comments made around the other public spaces around the building beyond the play space and how the public realm works at the ground floor level, and comments were made on place making objectives; and the applicants noted that further work needed to be done around the public realm and the building.
- Comments were made regarding the landscaping particularly around the play space and the long term maintenance of that space.
- Comments were made around sufficient storage for the units for occupation.
- Further comments were made on the affordable housing offer; the applicants informed that there was good momentum of 100% affordable provision, but the application was likely to seek a 50% provision.
- Comments were made around support for the existing commercial premises.
- There were comments relating the extent of which the Place Review Panel had an independent role to take view on the policy context and design which would be different to the local authority plan.
- There were also comments in regards to the wind.

The Chair thanked the applicants for their presentation, and looked forward to their application returning to the Committee at a later stage.

297/20 **Planning applications for decision**

298/20 **20/01436/FUL Land R/O 279-289 Selsdon Road, South Croydon, CR2 6PS**

Demolition of existing garages and erection of a three storey residential development of 8 flats, together with parking, landscaping improvements and other associated works.

Ward: South Croydon

THIS ITEM WAS WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING.

299/20 **20/01418/FUL Land at the junction of Fairchildes Avenue and King Henry's Drive, Croydon, CR0 0AJ**

Erection of a six-storey building to provide 17 flats together with car parking, landscaping and other associated works.

Ward: New Addington South

THIS ITEM WAS WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING.

300/20 **20/01658/FUL 36 Oakwood Avenue, Purley, CR8 1AQ**

Demolition of a single-family dwelling house and erection of 4x two storey semi-detached houses with accommodation in the roof, and 4x one-storey semi-detached houses with accommodation in the roof, with associated access, car parking, cycle and refuse storage.

Ward: Purley and Woodcote

The officers presented details of the planning application and responded to questions for clarification.

Mr Paul Rice spoke against the application.

Mr Ian Woodward-Court, the applicant's agent, in support of the application.

The Committee deliberated on the application presentation heard before them having heard all the speakers who addressed the Committee, and in turn addressed their view on the matter.

The substantive motion to **GRANT** the application based on the officer's recommendation was taken to the vote having been proposed by Councillor Paul Scott. This was seconded by Councillor Clive Fraser.

The substantive motion fell with four Members voting in favour, five Members voting against and one Member abstaining their vote.

.....  
Councillor Helen Pollard proposed for a motion to **REFUSE** the application on the grounds of out of character, over intensification and over development of the site and impact on neighbouring businesses and overdevelopment. Councillor Ian Parker seconded the motion.

The motion to refuse was put forward to a vote and carried with five Members voting in favour, four Members voting against and one Member abstaining their vote.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **REFUSE** the application for the development of 36 Oakwood Avenue, Purley, CR8 1AQ.

301/20 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

302/20 **Other planning matters**

303/20 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

The report was received for information.

The meeting ended at 10.13 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:** .....

This page is intentionally left blank