

Planning Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 25 January 2018 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

- Present:** Councillor Paul Scott (Chair);
Councillor Humayun Kabir (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Jamie Audsley, Richard Chatterjee, Sherwan Chowdhury,
Jason Perry, Joy Prince, Manju Shahul-Hameed, Sue Winborn and
Chris Wright
- Also Present:** Councillors Jane Avis, Alison Butler, Patsy Cummings, Maria Gatland and
Andy Stranack
- Apologies:** Councillors Luke Clancy and Bernadette Khan

PART A

14/18 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2018 be signed as a correct record.

15/18 **Disclosure of Interest**

In relation to item 5.1 the following declarations were made:

Councillor Scott declared a non-pecuniary interest that the architects firm TP Bennett, for which he was a junior partner, had undertaken work with the Crystal Palace Football Club Foundation seven years ago.

Councillor Perry and Wright declared that they were season ticket holders in the Main Stand at Selhurst Park.

16/18 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

17/18 **Development presentations**

18/18 **17/05999/PRE Crystal Palace Football Club, Whitehorse Lane, South Norwood**

Presentation of a pre-application scheme for alterations and extensions to the existing stadium, and in particular to increase seating capacity of the Main Stand by 8,000 additional seats and increase internal floor space beneath the stand by 20,000sqm.

Ward: Selhurst

Luke Raistrick, Nick Marshall and Greg Ricketts 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 during the discussion were as follows:

- Encouraging earlier arrival at the stadium would reduce peak congestion but would not necessarily increase sustainable transport use.
- The transport plan needed to address issues of dangerous overcrowding on pavements before and after games.
- The application should include detailed information about how the development would address the loss of housing and what steps were in place to rehouse the displaced social housing tenants. There should be significant engagement with affected tenants as part of this process.
- There was concern that the proposed date of application submission, early February 2018, was too soon and Members were apprehensive that the application was being rushed through.
- The Committee welcomed the commitment to sign up to the good employer charter and commit to the London Living Wage for staff.
- There should be a commitment to improve the public realm in the vicinity of the stadium as part of the development, to create a better sense of place and journey to the stadium.
- There should be greater cooperation with planning officers prior to the submission of the application, particularly on matters such as daylight impact on the area and rehousing solutions.
- Ensure the local community benefit from the development and look for opportunities to create facilities that can be used outside of match days for residents.

19/18 **Planning applications for decision**

20/18 **17/05701/FUL Shirley High School, Shirley Church Road, CR0 5EF**

Erection of 12 no. 10m high floodlight columns to illuminate existing netball courts.

Ward: Heathfield

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked for further detail on the proposed lights to be used in the development. The conditions of use were also clarified and the Committee were informed that an impact assessment after 12 months would be carried out and points were made as to the nature and methodology of such an assessment.

Jack Iacovou, speaking against the application, made the following points:

- There would be significant light spillage onto the properties nearest the courts.
- The courts were positioned very close to neighbouring properties.
- Guidelines on light levels were being ignored in the application.
- There were underused courts in other parts of the boroughs that could host the demand for venues.
- The extended hours would also create a noise nuisance to neighbouring properties, particularly at weekends.

Jackie Rowlands, speaking in favour of the application, made the following points:

- The netball courts had been in existence on the site since the 1960s and prior to the construction of the housing development.
- There had been discussions with local residents prior to the application being submitted.
- The courts hosted busy and popular leagues in the winter and summer seasons, with both adult and child competitions.
- The use of the courts promoted health and fitness to young people.

Councillor Stranack, speaking against the application as substitute for the referring Ward Member Councillor Margaret Mead, made the following points:

- School facilities were important but must be located in appropriate places. The application would place floodlights six metres.
- There were schools within a mile of the site which were underused and could accommodate the demand for courts.
- An appropriate compromise would be weekday use of the lights from 9am until 6pm.
- Concern was raised over the impact of the floodlighting on wildlife in the area.

The Head of Development Management responded with the following points:

- Neighbouring properties had large gardens and any potential light spillage would only affect the rear of these gardens. As the gardens were unlikely to be used during evenings in the winter months any light spillage would be unlikely to affect the amenity or use of that part of the properties.
- The management plan of the site could include how the courts are used, such as prioritising the use of courts furthest away from the properties to limit the impact.

Councillor Wright moved a motion for refusal on the grounds of loss of amenity to local residents, primarily caused by light spillage from the floodlights.

Councillor Scott moved for approval with an additional condition that the floodlights servicing the three courts nearest the residential properties be shut off by 8pm on weekdays. Councillor Perry seconded the motion.

The motion for approval with the additional condition was put to the vote and was carried with nine Members voting in favour and one Member voting against.

The Committee thus **RESOLVED** to grant the application at Shirley High School, Shirley Church Road, CR0 5EF with the following additional condition attached:

- The time of usage on weekdays for the three courts nearest the residential properties are 9am to 8pm.

21/18 **17/05708/FUL 1A West Hill, South Croydon CR2 0SB**

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked for details surrounding the conditions related to the site being an archaeological priority zone and further clarification on the dual aspect windows within the design.

Peter Myring, speaking against the application, made the following points:

- The area was becoming overdeveloped, with a similar development being approved at the Planning Committee just a few weeks previous.
- Over-intensification would have a significant effect on traffic in an area already very congested during peak times.
- The junction near the site was dangerous with poor visibility.
- The development would increase noise and air pollution to the area.
- The design was out of character with the area.

Mark Philpot, speaking in favour of the application, made the following points:

- There had been a number of pre-application submissions prior to the application coming to Committee.
- The development would respect the grain of development in the area and the quality of the architecture was high. Soft landscaping would be introduced which would include addition trees planted onsite.
- There would be adequate parking provision provided onsite.
- The development would create high quality accommodation in an accessible location.

Councillor Gatland, the referring Ward Councillor speaking against the application, made the following points:

- No affordable housing was included in the development.
- The application was replacing a large family home with a block of flats.
- Whilst claiming to be only two stories, this did not take account of the basement and roof developments.
- There were a lot of windows included in the design which would have an inevitable impact on overlooking nearby properties.
- The development would result in the loss of a significant amount of green space and no independent wildlife survey had been carried out.
- The development would increase the overdevelopment of the road and have a negative impact on existing residents.

The Head of Development Management responded with the following points:

- Officers had spent a lot of time working with the applicant over the design of the proposed development to ensure it kept within the character of the area.
- The development was an appropriate distance from neighbouring properties.
- The Highways team had considered the application and were satisfied that it provided for safe entry and exit to the site.

Councillor Perry moved for a motion of refusal, on the grounds that the development was out of character with the area, was an over-intensification of the site, and presented a risk to the safety of the highway.

Councillor Kabir moved for a motion of approval, and Councillor Scott seconded the motion.

Councillor Winborn seconded the motion for refusal.

The motion for approval was put to the vote first and was carried, with six Members voting in favour and four voting against. The second motion therefore fell.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to approve grant the application at 1A West Hill, South Croydon CR2 0SB.

The Committee held a brief adjournment between 21.18 to 21.24.

22/18 **17/04836/FUL Canterbury House, 2-6 Sydenham Road, CR0 9XE**

Following the officers' presentation there were no questions of clarification from the Committee.

Julian Carter, speaking in favour of the application, made the following points:

- The development offered 50% affordable accommodation with high quality management.
- It was an efficient use of space without affecting the functionality of the units.
- There was a communal rooftop amenity included as part of the development as well as external space on the ground floor for a recycling area and child's play space.
- The design of the building was high quality.
- There had been significant engagement with the public through consultations and a public exhibition, as well as engagement with planning officers.

Planning officers present made the following points:

- There were concerns with the size of individual units, including lack of amenity space and lack of natural light exposure.
- The affordable housing on offer was being compromised by the lack of space provided for each unit.

Councillor Scott moved, and Councillor Shahul-Hameed seconded, a motion for refusal on the grounds as stated at paragraph three of the report.

The motion was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to:

1. Refuse the application on the following grounds detailed in paragraph three of the report -
 - a. Liveability of Proposed development and Impact on Adjacent Dwellings
 - b. Inclusive Access including insufficient Blue Badge parking
 - c. Design
 - d. Mix
 - e. Insufficient Details
 - f. Mitigation
2. That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to refuse the planning permission subject to:
 - a. any direction from the Mayor of London;
 - b. amendments considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport to the Reasons for Refusal;

At 21.59 Councillor Scott proposed that the guillotine for the Committee be waived to ensure the completion of the remainder of business, which the Committee approved unanimously.

There were none.

24/18 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

The meeting ended at 10.01 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....