

PLANNING COMMITTEE  
18th November 2021

**- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -**

**Item 6.1 – 21/03083/FUL - 16D Highfield Hill, Upper Norwood**

Additional Residential Objections

Since the report was published 2 additional representations have been received, both objecting to the proposal.

The objections raise the same issue of the vehicle access leading into the site from Highfield Hill not being completely re-surfaced in accordance with a planning permission (Ref: 17/05867/FUL) to develop the adjacent site (now constructed as Podina House and 16a Highfield Hill). Condition 4 of the planning permission 17/05867/FUL required re-surfacing details of the vehicle access from Highfield Hill to be submitted to and approved by the Council. Details with regard to that condition were subsequently submitted and approved under application 18/02089/DISC.

As reported in paragraph 8.34 of the Committee report '*surface improvements have recently been implemented as a consequence of the new development of 1 detached house (16a Highfield Hill) and 4 flats (Podina House)*'. It is acknowledged the surface improvements to the vehicle access have only thus far been implemented within the extent of the application site for 16a Highfield Hill and Podina House, instead of fully to the back edge of the pavement with Highfield Hill. However, the Council is actively investigating and trying to resolve this matter through an ongoing enforcement investigation Ref: 21/00266/NCC.

Additional Conditions

With regard to paragraph 2.2 of the Committee report and recommended Conditions the Council also advises that:

1. A Fire Safety pre-commencement Condition will be added requiring submission to the LPA and approval of the full detail of the fire access route
2. Provision of Green Roofs - A pre-occupation Condition will be added requiring the implementation and retention of the green roofs at ground and first floor levels (as specified in the submitted landscaping plan).
3. Refuse Management Plan – The pre-occupation Condition 13 wording will also specifically require the Refuse Management Plan to include details of refuse collection arrangements.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Item 6.2 – 21/02846/FUL – 41 Fairdene Road, Coulsdon, CR5 1RD**

### Additional Residential Objections

Since the report was published 24 additional representations have been received, objecting to the proposal. The objections have been listed below with officer comments and it is indicated where the objections have already been addressed in the committee report:

- Building is large for the area (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Changes character of the neighbourhood – impact on visual amenity (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Overbearing design (Officer Comment: The design of the building has been fully assessed and is considered to be acceptable).
- Too bulky and fills the site (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Not in keeping with the streetscene (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Dormer window in the roof is dominating (Officer Comment: the design of the proposed dormer window in the front roof slope has been assessed and is considered to be appropriate in the context of the overall design of the building).
- Breaches the building line (Officer Comment: part of the proposed building line is in line with the adjacent buildings and it is only part of the front building line that extends forward of this. This element is set in from the side boundaries and is considered to be acceptable).
- Not enough car parking (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Flooding and impact on sewage (Officer Comment: the Flood Risk Assessment sets out a number of methods for slowing the flow of water across the site and a condition has been added for specifics of this to be agreed prior to the commencement of development. The capacity of sewage networks is the responsibility of Thames Water).
- No basement impact assessment (Officer Comment: the proposed development does not have a full basement as the lowest level of accommodation is above ground at the front of the site and it was considered that a basement impact assessment was not required in this instance).
- SUDS proposed are unlikely to be feasible (Officer Comments: a number of methods for dealing with surface water have been proposed and specific details of these are required by condition, prior to the commencement of development to ensure that an appropriate and workable solution can be put in place).
- Proposal is full of errors such as the number of units, the number of storeys and the orientation (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- No consultation by developer with residents and no Statement of Community Involvement (Officer Comment: these are required for major developments, environmentally sensitive developments, and sites and developments of

known or anticipated public interest. The proposal is not a major or environmentally sensitive development and it is difficult to predict which applications will generate public interest when they involve a minor number of dwellings such as this. Therefore, there was no reason at validation stage why a Statement of Community Involvement would have been required).

- Development will not result in an inclusive neighbourhood as required by the London Plan (Officer Comment: the application proposes flats of varying sizes to contribute to developing mixed and balanced communities. The proposal addresses accessibility matters as required by policy).
- Pressure on overburdened amenities (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Financial contribution should be for Coulsdon not other areas (Officer Comment: paragraph 8.68 of the report has been updated to reflect that this should be for Coulsdon).
- Loss of trees (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Flats not needed – already huge numbers of flats approved in the area (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Planning register was down for a weekend so there should be an extension to the deadline for comments (Officer Comment: the consultation period for this application ran until 12<sup>th</sup> November. This application is being presented to committee on 18<sup>th</sup> November and any comments received between the report being finalised and this addendum being produced are addressed here).
- Officer report has been published in advance of the consultation period ending (Officer Comment: as stated in the paragraph above, any comments received between the report being finalised and this addendum being produced are addressed here).
- Insufficient period of re-consultation as the additional documents are core documents that should have had a 21 day consultation period (Officer Comment: as set out above, there has been a sufficient period between the re-consultation being sent out and the application being presented to committee).
- Existing Edwardian building should not be removed. (Officer Comment: there are numerous examples of this type of Edwardian property around the Borough and there is no particular reason why this one should not be removed).
- Proposal is not well designed and beautiful contrary to NPPF (Officer Comment: the design of the building has been assessed and is considered to be acceptable).
- Sets a bad precedent (Officer Comment: all applications are assessed individually on their own merits and against adopted planning policies).
- Poor design – ugly (Officer Comment: the design of the building has been assessed and is considered to be acceptable).
- Environmental impact of demolition (Officer comment: whilst it is acknowledged that additional material will be generated, circular economy outcomes – as set out in policy SI7 of the London Plan, only apply to applications that are referable to the Mayor of London, which does not apply in this case).

- PTAL of the site cannot be changed just because the developer has advised you (Officer Comment: the rating for the PTAL of the site has been discussed between the developer and TfL and agreement has been reached. It is worth noting that the parking requirements for PTAL's 2 and 3 in the London Plan are identical).
- Lack of natural lighting for lower floor flat (Officer Comment: this flat is dual aspect and it is considered that the lightwell to the front is of a sufficient size to ensure adequate light can penetrate).
- Badgers found in the vicinity – is there an environmental survey? Ecology insufficiently considered. (Officer Comment: no evidence of badgers on site has been presented to officers. Ecology matters have been set out in the Planning Statement submitted and conditions have been added requiring biodiversity enhancements and landscaping. This is considered sufficient).
- Poor quality of accommodation – poorly lit circulation spaces (Officer Comment: the quality of accommodation has been assessed and is set out in the committee report).
- Poor manoeuvrability for underground car parking (Officer Comment: this has been assessed and found to be acceptable).
- Fire safety and air quality assessments not carried out on the basement. (Officer comment: fire safety information in line with London Plan requirements has been submitted with the application. An air quality assessment is not a validation requirement for this scale of development).
- Need more houses not flats (Officer Comment: housing need is set out in policy, it does not make the distinction between houses and flats. As set out in the committee report, flats would contribute to providing a mix of different housing types to facilitate mixed and balanced communities)
- No assessment of flood impact (Officer Comment: A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted for the application).
- The flood risk assessment indicates a heightened risk of flood
- Development would result in increased flooding
- Objections have not been taken into account (Officer Comment: All objections have been taken into account. Those received prior to the report being published have been addressed in the report and those received since are addressed here in this addendum).
- Impact on market value of houses. (Officer Comment: this is not a material planning consideration).
- Impact on road congestion from construction (Officer Comment: a condition has been added requiring a Construction Logistics Plan which will address matters including construction traffic and its impacts).
- Loss of trees and greenery (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Harm to neighbouring amenity due to size of proposal (Officer Comment: the impact of the proposal on neighbouring residential amenity has been fully addressed in the committee report and has been found to be acceptable).
- Overlooking/loss of privacy (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Pre-application advice not published (Officer Comment: pre-application advice would normally be published. It is acknowledged that this has not been done in this case. However, each application is assessed on its merits and the fact

that the pre-application advice has not been published would not affect member consideration of this application).

- Loss of light (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report).
- Noise and disruption from excavation (Officer Comment: this matter is addressed in the committee report – a condition has been added requiring a Construction Logistics Plan).
- Noise from pumps (Officer Comment: a condition has been added requiring details of noise from mechanical equipment to be submitted for approval).
- Developer has not been considerate during construction on a nearby site (Officer comment: officers and the committee are required to assess the details of the proposal put forward in this application. The developer's actions on a nearby site are not controllable by this proposal and would be subject to separate assessment and/or investigation).
- Conflict of interest between the planning agent and the Council Planning Department (Officer Comment: whilst the planning agent previously worked in the planning department, he did not work on schemes in the Borough for 6 months and it is considered that there is no conflict of interest).
- Daylight study is only a desk top study which is unacceptable (Officer Comment: for this scale of development, a desk top study is considered to be appropriate).
- Daylight and sunlight study does not consider the level of light within the scheme (Officer Comment: the Council's validation checklist only requires the Daylight and Sunlight study to assess the impact of proposals on adjoining and nearby developments. Notwithstanding this, an assessment of the quality of the accommodation proposed forms part of the assessment by officers and has been found to be acceptable.)
- Right to light concerns (Officer Comment: rights to light are covered by separate legislation and are not a material planning consideration).
- Replacement of saplings with mature trees is greenwashing (Officer Comment: the impact of the development on the existing trees and vegetation has been found to be acceptable. A condition has been added to control the details of the landscaping to be installed on site).
- Tree roots will be impacted by the development (Officer Comment: the impact of the development on trees has been fully assessed and is considered acceptable).
- Double stacking of cycle storage confirms that this is overdevelopment (Officer Comment: Sheffield style stands have been proposed for cycle parking and an adaptable space – these are not double stacked).
- Basement excavation will result in additional material going to landfill (Officer comment: whilst it is acknowledged that additional material will be generated, circular economy outcomes – as set out in policy SI7 of the London Plan, only apply to applications that are referable to the Mayor of London, which does not apply in this case).
- Sustainable transport contribution is paltry and six figure sums should be obtained for all new developments (Officer Comment: the sustainable transport contribution has been negotiated in line with other schemes, our policies and with what the Council is able to justify).

- Parking stress survey was carried out during a lockdown and parking has increased since (Officer comment: parking provision on site is in line with policy requirements and there are on street parking restrictions at certain times of the day, with residents ability to gain access to on-street permits removed by the S106 agreement. This is sufficient to ensure that there would not be an unacceptable impact on on-street parking. No objection has been received from Strategic Transport in this regard).
- The significance of the area as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset has not been considered. (Officer Comment: there are numerous examples of this type of Edwardian property around the Borough and there is no particular reason why this one should be considered as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset).
- Human Rights Act has not been considered (Officer Comment: As the planning assessment of the scheme has been undertaken and found to be acceptable, officers do not believe that the development would breach the Human Rights Act).

### Other Matters

Informative no. 7 should refer to conditions 13 &15, not condition 11 and should read as follows:

7. Refuse and cycle storage Informative (in relation to conditions 13 &15)

Conditions 5, 6 and 8 should be submitted prior to the commencement of any superstructure.

Condition 19 should be submitted prior to commencement of development.

Additional condition:

Submission and approval of details of mechanical equipment to be installed in the building.

Paragraph 8.68 should read as follows:

8.68 A contribution of £13,500 will be secured via S106 agreement to contribute towards sustainable transport initiatives in the local area including on street car clubs with electric vehicle charging points (ECVPs) within the Coulsdon area as well as general expansion of the EVCP network in the area in line with Local Plan policies SP8.12 and SP8.13. The funding will go towards traffic orders at around £2500, signing, lining of car club bay, EVCP provision including electrics and set up costs for the car club. Every residential unit is to be provided with a minimum 3-year membership to a local car club scheme upon 1st occupation of the unit. Funding will also be used for extension and improvements to walking and cycling routes in the area and improvements to local bus stops to support and encourage sustainable methods of transport.

This page is intentionally left blank