

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 25th February 2021

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 20/00107/FUL 2 - 4 Addington Road

Since the publication of the report 42 additional representations have been received, all of which are objections. These objections have raised a number of points already covered within the case officer's report, with the following new material planning considerations raised:

- No need for flats [*Officer Comment: flats and houses are both considered as homes of which there is a pressing need, as set out in the main report.*]
- Development should occur in central Croydon as opposed to such locations [*Each application is assessed on its own merits. For the reasons set out in the report, this site is considered to be a suitable location for development.*]
- Likely future loss of local amenities [local supermarkets] makes the development unacceptable [*Officer Comment: whether or not a supermarket ceases to trade is outside the control of the planning system. The site is in any case considered to be a suitable location for this development.*]
- The proposal is unacceptable due to the pandemic [*Officer Comment: Whilst the pandemic has resulted in some changes to people's lifestyles, this is of a temporary nature and the proposal needs to be determined in accordance with adopted policy.*]

Item 6.2 20/02136/FUL The Sandrock, 152 Upper Shirley Road

Since the publication of the report 10 additional representations have been received, all of which are objections. These objections have raised a number of points already covered within the case officer's report, with the following new material planning considerations raised:

- Loss of trees [*Officer Comment: this issue is addressed in the main report however please note comments below relating to paragraph 8.31*]

The following procedural issues were raised:

- Not all revised plans are viewable online [*Officer Comment: Officers have checked the relevant systems and online register and confirm these were made viewable to the public*]
- Change to the description of development [*Officer Comment: The description has changed to make clear that some of the 15 units proposed in Block B are houses as opposed to flats*]
- Amendments should have resulted in a new application [*Officer Comment: Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the officers report sets out the changes to the scheme. Officers are satisfied that these could be treated as amendments to the proposal*]

Paragraph 3.2 and 3.3 (list of amendments) should also include the following:

- Improved and enlarged front seating area for public house users
- Retaining wall towards the south pushed further back – to improve future occupiers outlook
- Removal of the side bridge from Upper Shirley Road to Block B – removes an overbearing addition and potential issues for overlooking for to future occupiers

Paragraph 8.5 of the officers report states that 209sqm of existing public house space would be lost. However, the applicants have confirmed that the commercial letter submitted had an error. The existing pub floor space is 209sqm and would be increased to 271.4sqm regardless of the demolition of the rear aspect of the existing pub. The proposed side extension and internal modifications would create a net gain of 62.4sqm. With that being said, this would not change the Councils position and would in fact be an overall improvement.

Paragraph 8.31 considers tree lost. In total, 11 trees and 3 groups are being proposed to be removed. As mentioned in paragraph 8.32, in total, 12 new high quality trees are being proposed as mitigation. Whilst not a net gain in terms of numbers, but would be in terms of quality considering that two of the trees to be lost are Category U and eight are Category C. The 12 trees is considered to be a sufficient mitigation and the relevant conditions attached can be adapted to include additional tree planting.

Paragraph 8.90 final sentence should read "...the proposal would comply with the relevant Policies..."

Item 6.4 – 20/06224/FUL - 922 - 930 Purley Way

Since the publication of the report 36 additional representations, all of which are objections. These objections have raised a number of points already covered within the case officer's report, with the following new material planning considerations raised:

- Loss of light to Coldharbour Lane [*Officer Comment: Coldharbour Lane is currently heavily planted and includes large mature street trees. Whilst there would be some impact on this route, there would be natural surveillance of this existing route created by the proposal which would improve this public route.*]
- Impact upon parking pressure in Russell Hill Road, potentially leading to residents parking on Coldharbour Lane. [*Officer Comment: Russell Hill Road, directly adjacent to the rear of the site is located within the Purley Permit Zone. Whilst some of the wider area currently sits outside of the permit zone, as part of the developments approved at 29 - 35 Russell Hill Road i.e (ref. 19/03604/FUL) a financial contribution was secured via s106 to allow a review of the surrounding streets and the controlled hours of parking to inform future CPZ provision. In relation to residents parking within Coldharbour Lane, whilst this does allow access to existing garages, this is a public bridleway and this could be enforced through additional signage and bollards, which can be secured via s278 agreements.*]

- Given the scale of the development, the application over the Christmas period with little/no publicity is very dubious. *[Officer Comment: The application has been consulted upon in line with statutory and local legislation/guidance. This included neighbour notification letters being sent to 67 of the closest adjoining occupiers, email notification to local Councillors and MP press notices being included with the local press and site notices being erected surrounding the site].*

- The air quality document in this application is not applicable. No assessment was made anywhere near the site. *[Officer Comment: The air quality assessment has been assessed accordingly and is considered to have been conducted in accordance with national regional and local legislation/guidance].*

- Reduction in natural habitats and impact upon ecology. *[Officer Comment: The proposal application has been submitted with a detailed ecology appraisal. The ecology appraisal identifies that 930 Purley Way supports bats and therefore as a European Protected Species Licence is required prior to commencement and is proposed to be secured via condition. The report details that there are currently 9 invasive species on site and 3 species of special concern which are considered to be detrimental to the ecological value of the site and are proposed to be removed further improving the potential ecological benefits of a scheme on this site. The proposal also includes biodiversity net gains on site in the form of new planting, bat boxes, bird boxes and green/living roofs throughout all 3 blocks].*

Relating to section 9.61 of the officer report, there is noted to be an error in the following sentence:

“10 trees, 3 groups of trees and 3 hedges (totalling 24 in quantity) are proposed to be removed as part of the development (none of which are formally protected), with one of those trees noted to be a B grade trees”

This should in fact read as:

“10 trees, 4 groups of trees and 3 hedges (totalling 19 trees in total) are proposed to be removed as part of the development (none of which are formally protected), with one of those trees noted to be a B grade tree”.

This page is intentionally left blank