

1st July Planning Committee Addendum

Item 6.1 20/04307/FUL – 56 West Hill

Paragraph 1.0 should be revised to state that the scheme is in South Croydon Ward.

Paragraph 3.6 should be revised to state that the site is in a PTAL of 1b (as correctly stated elsewhere in the report)

An additional 53 representations have been received, all objecting to the proposal. As well as raising the issues raised in the main report, the following additional comments are made:

- Loss of light [OFFICER COMMENT: Officers are satisfied the proposal would not give rise to a significant loss of light to neighbouring properties]
- Non-compliance with various policies and misleading report [OFFICER COMMENT: Officers are satisfied that the officers report responds to the issues raised by the application and is an appropriate consideration of the issues and policy requirements]
- Units have not been demonstrated to meet accessibility standards [OFFICER COMMENT: Policy requires that 90% of units meet M4(2) standard and 10% M4(3). This is how the scheme has been designed and what is required by condition. Standard 25 of the London Housing SPG (an adopted guidance document) states that dwelling plans should demonstrate that the furniture required can be accommodated based on occupancy, including the furniture required in relation to Part M. The submitted drawings show furniture layouts and turning spaces are shown for the M4(3) unit. Officers are satisfied with the information provided and with the use of conditions. The reasoned justification to the London Plan sets out that this approach should be taken – with conditions requiring that units meet the M4(3) and M4(2) standard to allow the Building Control body to check the detailed compliance against the requirements.]
- The bin store is inadequate [OFFICER COMMENT: this is discussed in paragraph 8.44 of the officers report. The representation draws attention to the lack of 2m clear space in front of the bins to allow for the bins to be moved without others needing to be moved, as set out in the Council's non-statutory waste guidance document. The bin store does not have a 2m clear space in front of the bins, but it would still allow each bin to be separately removed and so is considered satisfactory.]
- The Cycle store is inadequate as is the recommended condition [OFFICER COMMENT: this is discussed in paragraph 8.43 of the officers report. Officers

are satisfied that there is adequate room in the cycle store for the 16 bicycles and the recommended condition is satisfactory.]

- Suitability of SuDS strategy without infiltration testing [OFFICER COMMENT: the drainage strategy proposes that the scheme infiltrates surface water, subject to a percolation test to ensure the ground is suitable for this (paragraph 8.46). The objection is concerned as to what would happen should the ground not be appropriate for infiltration. The condition will require full details of a SuDS strategy to be submitted. Infiltration is the first option in the “drainage hierarchy” – if this is not available other sustainable drainage solutions can be acceptable and can be dealt with by the condition.]
- Concerns raised about the appropriateness of a condition to secure a construction logistics plan [OFFICERS COMMENT: the use of a condition on this site is considered appropriate]
- Use of planning conditions [OFFICERS COMMENT: The use of planning conditions is an important tool and they should be used to control details of schemes or the delivery of certain items, as they are being used here]
- That officers are destroying roads and lining pockets [OFFICERS COMMENT: all schemes are appropriately considered against the development plan and other material considerations]
- Other Boroughs do not permit such schemes [OFFICERS COMMENT: all schemes are appropriately considered against the development plan and other material considerations]