

Planning Committee

Meeting of Croydon Council's Planning Committee held virtually on Thursday, 15 October 2020 at 6:30pm via Microsoft Teams.

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

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Chris Clark (Chair);
Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Paul Scott, Clive Fraser, Toni Letts, Gareth Streeter, Lynne Hale, Joy Prince (In place of Callton Young), Michael Neal (In place of Scott Roche) and Vidhi Mohan (In place of Ian Parker)

Also Present: Councillors Robert Canning, Sean Fitzsimons and Patricia Hay-Justice

PART A

236/20 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 8 October 2020 be signed as a correct record.

237/20 **Disclosure of Interest**

Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel declared that she had previously worked with the projects landscape architect in relation to item 5.2 19/05195/PRE 550 to 550A Purley Way, Croydon, CR0 4RF on an old project in her current workplace.

238/20 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

239/20 **Development presentations**

240/20 **20/00549/PRE 922-930 Purley Way, Purley, CR8 2JL**

Erection of three apartments blocks to provide 149 homes with a maximum height of 14 storeys with alterations to the land levels associated landscaping, continued use of the existing highway accesses and car/cycle parking as well as bin storage.

Ward: Purley and Woodcote

This item was deferred to be heard at the next planning committee meeting.

241/20 **19/05195/PRE 550 to 550A Purley Way, Croydon, CR0 4RF**

Demolition of existing commercial properties, erection of two blocks, a southern block of 8 storeys, and northern block up to 15 storeys, providing 125 homes including 4 live/work units, with car and cycle parking and associated landscaping.

Ward: Waddon

Mr Nik Smith from Nexus Planning who are the planning consultants to this development was joined by Mr Dean Thody and Ms Jennifer Robertson from ECE Architecture, Mr Ben Howard from I-Transport, Mr Philip Cave who is the projects landscape architect and Mr Jack Simmons from Stonegate Homes who is the applicant of this development. The developers 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:

Tall building

- Some disagreement as to whether it was right for the scheme to come forward now or whether it needed to wait for the Masterplan
- Some members felt the scheme responds to the Masterplan well and would be appropriate densification, maximising use of the site
- Visual introduction for what to come in the future so scheme needs to be inspiring
- Scheme is beyond the upper limit of the density matrix - need to ensure infrastructure can support it
- Some members felt the tall building focus should be in the district centres and that 15 storeys would not work

Use

- Merit in and support for co-working space
- Queried whether similar live-work been successful elsewhere
- Support for ground floor uses and mix of workspace
- Positive that it would provide places to live, work and play
- Some members felt the loss of retail was acceptable, others were concerned about the loss of jobs
- Questioned whether a nursery could be provided on site

Design and elevation details

- Some members felt the height was appropriate, but consensus was that use of setbacks and material variation need to break up height and mass

- Some members questioned whether it was a marker building - could it be more innovative or more iconic
- Lots of discussion on material choice - some members preferred brick, some liked the terracotta, others felt a mixture was important
- Design should reference other buildings in the area
- Support for Art Deco style rounded corners

Site layout and public realm

- Positive that there appears no distinction between the private and affordable housing
- Decks above parking that provide amenity were generally supported and support for the balcony flexibility
- Welcome the public realm which is key
- Landscaping really important in helping mitigate pollution
- Trees in planters a concern - need to survive
- Security for residents will be important with car park to rear under deck

Level of affordable housing.

- Percentage should be higher than 30% - policy seeks to achieve 50%

Future residents

- Family mix - lots of 2 bedroom 4 person homes - concerned that there needs to be more genuine family accommodation
- Communal amenity spaces - need to be of high quality and far away from Purley Way as possible with adequate sunlight
- Should avoid single aspect units - particularly north facing
- Air quality and noise considerations will be key
- The importance of accessibility and disabled units was stressed
- There should be more than 8 M4(3) homes

Neighbouring living conditions.

- Some disagreement as to impact on immediate neighbours - some members thought no issue, others were concerned primarily with the impact on the cottages to the south

Car parking provision

- Should explore car parking stackers to minimise space

Other

- Members questioned the environmental credentials of the scheme beyond planning policy

Ward Member Councillor Robert Canning was invited to share his local viewpoint on the development presentation.

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

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the election of a Chair for the remainder of the meeting was voted on in the absence of Chair and Vice-Chair. Councillor Vidhi Mohan proposed for Councillor Gareth Streeter to be Chair for the remainder of this Planning Committee meeting. Councillor Chris Clark seconded the motion.

At 8:02pm the Planning Committee adjourned the meeting for a short break

At 8:02pm Councillors Chris Clark, Lelia Ben-Hassel, Toni Letts and Clive Fraser left the meeting.

At 8:06pm the Planning Committee reconvened the meeting.

242/20 **19/05194/PRE Citylink House, 4 Addiscombe Road, Croydon, CR0 5TT**

Demolition of the existing buildings. Erection of a part 27/part 13 storey building to provide approximately 494 shared-living units (sui-generis), 77 residential dwellings (C3), flexible (D1/B1) floorspace and retail/café (A1/A3) space.

Ward: Addiscombe West

Mr Joe Stockton from DP9 was joined by his colleague Mr Sam Hine also from DP9, Mr Alex Springer from Fifthstate who is the developer and applicant, Mr Murray Levinson from Squires and Partners Architects and Mr James Brant from CRM. The developers attended to give a presentation and respond to Members' questions and issues raised for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application.

At 8:15pm Councillors Paul Scott and Joy Prince left the meeting.

The main issues raised at this meeting were as follows:

Standard of co-living and residential accommodation

- Members questioned the shared living concept - what is the need in Croydon?
- Questioned tenancy periods and affordability
- How many people would be in the building?
- General concern about co-living in current Covid19 climate
- Questioned whether there are national standards for units and kitchen/amenity shared spaces
- Would there be single gender accommodation opportunities?
- Members were worried the scheme does not serve families
- Challenged the amount of outside amenity space
- Questioned disabled home provision

Height and design approach

- Site is a prominent location - is it eye-catching enough?

- Some members liked the design and commented that it fits in with local character
- Some members did not like design - plain grey concrete tower that does not respect NLA tower
- Scheme occupies the full extent of site - felt it was too big in the current form

Site layout

- Support for the removal of the underpass
- With lots of people the pedestrian routes will be key - transportation issues need to be carefully considered

Loss of trees

- Unhappy about the loss of the high quality trees

Affordable housing offer

- Affordability discussion - meets a certain demographic only

Other

- Fire evacuation important

243/20 **Planning applications for decision**

There were none.

244/20 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

245/20 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....