

**27th September 2018 Planning Committee
Addendum**

Item 6.1: 18/00749/FUL- 34 Arkwright Road, South Croydon CR2 0LL

Revised documents have been received from the applicant amending the boundary position following a resident representation. As such the drawing number list should read as follows:

BX27-S1-102B; BX27-S1-104B; BX27-S1-105B; BX27-S1-106B; BX27-S1-107B; BX27-S1-108B; BX27-S1-109B; BX27-S1-110B; BX27-S1-111B; BX27-S1-112B all uploaded on 21st August 2018 and BX27-S1-105C uploaded on 23rd August 2018 and BX27-S1-101C and BX27-S1-103D uploaded on 19th September 2018.

Paragraph 8.13 should read as follows:

In terms of accessibility, level access would be provided from the front door to the three ground floor units (which includes the family unit). London Plan states that developments of four stories or less require disabled unit provisions to be applied flexibly to ensure that the development is deliverable. Given the limitations of the footprint to provide the required accommodation, it is considered that one of the ground floor units should be M4(3) adaptable and the other two should be M4(2), This can be secured by condition. A disabled space is proposed for the parking area.

Since the drafting of the Committee Report two further additional representations have been received objecting raising issues that have been addressed in the officer's report. In addition to these the following comments have also been raised:

- Overlooking to number 28 Arkwright Road [OFFICER COMMENT: The impacts on the properties most affected have been addressed in the Committee Report. In terms of 28 Arkwright Road given that this property is approximately 30m from the site, and is located behind numbers 30 and 32 Arkwright Road at an oblique angle it is not considered that the scheme would have any significant impacts on their residential amenity. The existing relationship is shown below]



- Boundary issues [OFFICER COMMENT: The applicant has amended the red line to show the correct boundary lines and the drawing numbers have been updated to reflect this]
- Protected species [OFFICER COMMENT: A protected species report has been provided by the applicant that confirms no evidence such as setts, snuffle holes or latrines to suggest that protected species are dependent on the application site. The site does support suitable habitat although the report considers protected species to be absent. However the transient nature could result in individuals occasionally foraging or commuting through the site. There are mitigation measures proposed in the report, recommended by condition]

Item 6.2:18/01994/FUL – Ridge Hanger Park Hill Rise

Since the drafting of the Committee Report a further representation has been received from a resident in Greenacres stating:

The development would result in a significant loss of light to a side window and a rear bay window due to the height of the development.

Item 6.4: 18/03313/FUL- 55 Hillcrest Road, Purley, CR8 2JF

- Condition 14 has been amended. Paragraph 2.2 should, therefore, read:
14) Ground floor units to comply with requirements of Part M4(2) accessibility standard and 1 ground floor unit to comply with Part M4(3)
- Unit 5 has been amended to include a balcony. Paragraph 3.2 should, therefore, read:

The 3 bedroom flats on the ground floor, 1 of the 2 bedroom flats on the first floor and 2 of the flats on the second floor would have their own private amenity space. A communal garden with an allocated play space would be available at the rear for the other flats to use and share.

- Furthermore, paragraph 8.4 should also read:

The 3 bed family units on the ground floor would have their own private rear gardens and 1 of the 2 bedroom flats on the first floor and 2 of the flats on the second floor would have private balconies. One unit does not have private amenity space but a communal garden with an allocated play space would be available at the rear of the site for this unit to use and share. This would be directly accessed by a back door from the communal hallway.

- An error has been made at Paragraph 4. This should read:

The proposal would deliver 3 family units (2 x 3 bed/4 person units and 1 x 2 bed/4 person unit).

- Paragraph 6.2 should include the following officer response:

Representations have raised concern over the intensification of the site and overdevelopment. The site is a suburban setting with a PTAL rating of 1A and as such the London Plan indicates that the density levels ranges of 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha). The proposal be in excess of this range at 350 hr/ha. However, the London Plan further indicates that it is not appropriate to apply these ranges mechanistically, as the density ranges are broad, to enable account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential – such as local context, design and transport capacity. These considerations have been satisfactorily addressed, and the London Plan provides sufficient flexibility for such higher density schemes to be supported.

Item 6.5: 18/03059/OUT – 141 Brancaster Lane, Purley, CR8 1HL

- One additional representation was received objecting to the development. The issues raised are already covered in the officer report.
- There is an error in Paragraph 8.24. This should be updated to read:

The site is currently a residential garden on a corner plot, and is not in close proximity to any designated sites for nature conservation so the ecological and biodiversity value of the site is likely to be limited. It is recommended an informative be included on the decision notice to advise the applicant to refer to the standing advice by Natural England, in the event protected species are found on site.

- Since the publication of the report, a parking stress survey has been submitted by the applicant. This was undertaken during a weekday peak period and overnight (Wednesday 19th and Thursday 20th September) to take account of the impact of both commuter parking for the railway station and overnight residential parking demand. This survey incorporated realistic parking availability, for example excluding roads which are inappropriate for parking due to width, and roads such as Riddlesdown Avenue where parking can only realistically take place on one side of the road. Parking stress is generally deemed as high when there is an 85% saturation. Whilst the survey demonstrates there is high demand for parking in the

area, taking an overview of all roads in the study area the stress levels do not reach this level of saturation. The highest levels of parking stress are seen on a weekday evening peak hour (an average of 80.5%), demonstrating the impact of commuter parking in the area, whilst parking stress is much lower overnight (64%) when local residents are parked in the area. It is not envisaged that there would be overspill of car parking onto the road as outlined in the report, however if this were to be the case the survey shows that this could be accommodated in the area without exceeding saturation points, importantly at night when these local residents would be parking. This is therefore considered to demonstrate that the parking provision is acceptable and in accordance with policy.

Item 6.6: 18/03185/OUT - 20 Manor Way, Purley, CR8 3BH

- Replace paragraph 8.2 with the following:

The application site is currently occupied by a detached single storey bungalow which is in single family occupancy and is currently occupied. The current GIA is 143sqm and so the development would not result in the net loss of a small family dwelling house.

- Add the following to paragraph 8.4 of the Officers report:

Representations have raised concerns over the intensification of the site and overdevelopment. The site is a suburban setting with a PTAL rating of 1a and as such the London Plan indicates that the density levels ranges of 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) the proposal would within this range at 160 hr/ha.

- An additional condition is suggested in respect of the ground floor units being compliant with M4(3) of the 2013 Building Regulation.
- Two additional representations have been received following the publication of the Officers report. These representations do not raise any new matters which are not already covered in the Officers report.

Item 6.7: 18/01711/FUL – Coombe Lodge Playing Fields, Melville Avenue, South Croydon, CR2 7HY

- The site location plan on page 107 does not show the current scheme. The updated site location plan is shown below. There is a slight change in the path arrangement in the north west corner of the site. The rest of the images in the committee report reflect the current scheme.



- Condition 44 is amended to the following:

Details of parking arrangements and management for coach town centre overspill parking.

- Existing condition 44 becomes condition 45.

- Paragraph 5.4 of the report shall read:

Construction is hoped to commence in January 2019 with the sports hall and main school building constructed concurrently. It is hoped that the sports hall will be completed before the main school building and could be available for limited use by the School. Full completion is programmed for the Summer 2020.

Item 6.8: 18/03090/FUL- 34 Caterham Drive, Coulsdon, CR5 1JF

The following conditions should be added at Paragraph 2.2:

14) Carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the Conceptual Surface Water Strategy Report;

15) Sustainable drainage (information to include topographical survey with surface water flow, runoff rates/detailed calculations, exceedance flows, layout plan of drainage scheme, maintenance/ownership plan for SUDs and resilience measures to minimise flood risk) – prior to any construction on site.

Paragraph 8.18 should be updated to read:

The site falls within a surface water flood risk area. The applicant has carried out infiltration testing at the site as part of a Conceptual Surface Water Strategy Report (dated September 2018). The recommendations within this report will be conditioned as part of any approval at the site. The Surface Water Strategy Report has been reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority and the proposed approach outlined in the report is considered acceptable and would result in a reduction of surface water entering the sewer system. A detailed condition is recommended in order to ensure that there is no increase to flood risk.

**27th September 2018 Planning Sub Committee
Addendum**