

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 25th March 2021

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 – 20/05474/FUL 3 Kingswood Way, South Croydon, CR2 8QL

Since the publication of the committee report six additional representations have been submitted. However, all bar the following point have been covered by the officer report.

- Insufficient information submitted relating to excavation. *[Officer Comment: Officers are satisfied that suitable details including cross sections have been submitted].*

Paragraph 8.45 begins “The site is not located in any designated flood risk area.” This should be updated to “The site is not located in any designated fluvial flood risk area but is in an area at high risk of surface water flooding”.

Item 6.2 20/01953/FUL 219 Farley Road South Croydon CR2 7NQ

Since the publication of the committee report 28 additional representations have been submitted. No additional issues have been raised.

Item 6.3 - 20/05326/FUL 37 Kingswood Lane CR6 9AB

Since the publishing of the report, an additional 16 written objections have been received. No additional planning considerations not mentioned in the Committee report have been raised in these representations except for the following:

- People need room to work from home. *[Officer Comment: units internally need to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and be of good quality, which officers are satisfied these are]*
- Concerns about the accuracy of submitted visualisations including regarding representation of trees *[Officer Comment: visualisations do not form approved/refused drawings. They are helpful to visualise how the proposal may look but would contain some inaccuracies inherent in their creation. Officers are satisfied that the visualisations are typical of those produced for a scheme such as this but agree that they suggest a more mature existing tree specimens at the front of the site]*
- Concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties – the report misidentifies side facing windows as being secondary when they are principal room windows serving a bedroom. *[Officer Comment: the report refers to one of the side facing windows at 35 Kingswood Lane as being a secondary window to a living room however an objector has told us that this serves a bedroom. They have confirmed that the layout of this property is with a bedroom to the front (served by a front facing window), a bedroom to the side (served by the side facing window mis-identified as a lounge) and the lounge is located to the rear – this is considered further below.]*
- Concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties – 45 degrees line is drawn incorrectly from 41

No additional consideration are required regarding the first two points above. Regarding the third, the clarity is welcomed. Previously officers were satisfied that this would have a minimal

impact being a secondary window but the proposal would have an impact on this bedroom. However officers are satisfied that this impact would be acceptable; the Suburban Design Guide gives very little protection to side facing windows which directly overlook adjacent sites. It should be noted that the window is located off the boundary by the width of the garage but the scheme would still impact on the window. However as it serves a bedroom, to which it is generally accepted that light is less important, is side facing and faces towards the neighbouring property and the impact on the other windows serving this property is minimal, officers are satisfied that this impact is acceptable.

Regarding the final point, the 45degree line is drawn from the conservatory to no 41. Officers are satisfied that this is appropriate.

Paragraph 7.1 erroneously refers to the previous London Plan and should refer to the London Plan 21.