

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 19/01352/FUL 56 Woodmere Avenue

Recommend that we add the standard highways informative to read as follows

“Where works are to be undertaken in on or over a public highway, the highways works must be carried out by the Local Authority funded by the developer, following a technical design review. Before construction works can commence, the applicant is required to submit to the Highways Development Team – Highways Croydon, the proposed design drawings for highways consideration.

An application form is available online at:
<https://www.croydon.gov.uk/transportandstreets/rhps/section278>

For further information, please contact Highways Development on 0208 255 2816 or via email at highwaysdevelopment@croydon.gov.uk. Please be advised the approval process will take a minimum of 12 weeks to complete.”

Item 6.2 19/02209/FUL 48 Mitchley Hill

Paragraph 1.1: Councillor Tim Pollard referred this application for Planning Committee consideration

5 further letters have been received following on from the publication of the report raising the following issues

- Out of keeping
- Poor design
- Overdevelopment – habitable rooms per hectare in excess of guidance
- Impact on green space
- Loss of light
- Noise
- Traffic/Highways - Inadequate amount of parking
- Lack of local infrastructure

These issues have already been covered in the considerations section of the officer's report.

Paragraph 8.4 was included in error and has limited bearing on the consideration of character and appearance.

Paragraph 8.27: The scheme proposes 10 off street car parking spaces for 9 units with one space provided for each unit with one visitor space.

Item 6.3 18/05157/FUL 2-5 Barrowsfield

- Error in report – Paragraph 8.12 states that all of the 2 bedroom units are 4 person. The plans have been amended and subsequently 3 of the 2 bedroom units are 3 person. This means that the development overall provides 76% family sized units which still exceeds the policy requirement of 70%.
- 36 additional representations have been received since the report was drafted, the issues raised are already covered in the report.
- The letter addressed to Planning Committee Members has been seen by officers – which requires a detailed response (outlined below)

Consultation on Amended Plans

- Consultation on the amended plans should have been for 28 days as the plans contain major material changes
(OFFICERS RESPONSE): We re-consulted on this scheme on 3rd July 2019 and in accordance with custom and practice, we gave residents 16 days to make further representations (which allows also for postage).
- Further amended plans were added to the website on 23 July 2019 and the neighbours should have been re-consulted
(OFFICERS RESPONSE) the amended plans introduced limited elevational changes which in effect re-introduced design elements previously consulted upon or introduced elements which have no bearing on the varied planning considerations (re-introducing projecting balconies at the southern end of the building, the re-introduction of the double height entrance and the installation of some windows in the north elevation overlooking the recreation ground to improve the outlook for the corner units as well as some internal changes to the layout of three flats). Officers are totally satisfied that no third party interest has been prejudiced as a consequence of these later amendments.
- How could officers write a report and consider all objections 12 working hours after the close of the consultation period. The report must have been written beforehand, disregarding public opinion which amounts to pre-determination
(OFFICER RESPONSE) All of the representations received were read and digested by the planning officer and are summarised in the officer report.

Comments on Officer's Report

- Paragraph 8.11 Misinterpretation of Policy DM1.2
(OFFICER RESPONSE) Policy DM1.2 advises that it will permit the redevelopment of residential units where it does not result in the net loss of 3 bedroom homes (as originally built) **or** the loss of homes smaller than 130 sq metres. This policy does not require compliance with both policy elements and in this particular case, the proposed development seeks to significantly increase the number of family units with 13 of the proposed units having 3 bedrooms – suitably sized for a family. Not only is there no net loss, there is a substantial net increase.

- Paragraph 8.30 Misinterpretation of density matrix in London Plan
(OFFICER RESPONSE) Officers are satisfied with the density of development and consider that the site circumstances allow for a density of development proposed. The Croydon Local Plan 2018 recognizes the step change required to deliver the required housing numbers and the Suburban Design Guide provides further guidance and advice as to how this might be realized. In many ways, this policy approach has greater weight than the London plan Density Matrix which is generally recognized as being outdated (in view of the challenge to deliver more homes).

Whilst it is appreciated that the site is located in a relatively low PTAL area, it is situated diagonally opposite a popular and well-used Waitrose store and is in immediately adjacent to extensive areas of open space and recreational grounds – which also allows for greater height and scale of development without detrimentally affecting the amenities of immediate neighbours. All proposed residential units would have private amenity space in accordance with guidance, with further communal amenity space provided in accordance with policy. Whilst car parking is less than 1-1, the on street car parking stress survey has identified spare on-street capacity, which will be able to accommodate any overspill and the applicant has agreed to provide a car club bay in the vicinity of the site alongside a financial contribution towards its continuation (over a 3 year period).

The proposed fourth and fifth floor is proposed to be set well back from the main façade and the CGIs provide a helpful indication that the fifth floor would not be overly visible from the street with the parapet details and the projecting bay elements being more prominent features when viewed from the street. The site is somewhat of an island (being bounded by Limpsfield Road as well as open spaces on two sides) which also allows for greater height, scale and mass (and consequential density) across parts of the building. The site has open corners to the north and south which again gives scope to increase heights.

- Paragraph 8.26 regarding the height of the proposed building is misleading. The 5 storey element spans 50% of Limpsfield Road and the building is 4.8m higher than Yew Tree Court not 1.3m higher. The fifth storey is only set back 1.5m.
(OFFICERS RESPONSE): For clarity, paragraph 8.26 states that the fifth storey element spans half the width of the building. The report states that the fourth storey is 1.3m higher than Yew Tree Court, not the entire building. Part of the fifth floor is set back 1.5 metres but other elements of the fifth floor are set back by approximately 7 metres. In any case, officers are satisfied that the upper floors are appropriately recessed.
- Paragraph 8.24 is misleading – this is not a corner plot as Barrowsfield is a narrow private drive.
[OFFICER RESPONSE): The Suburban Design Guide refers to corner plots as working with dual aspect, which this site does. There is no other specific definition. The building dual two frontages (especially in view of the neighbouring open spaces) and as such officers consider it entirely appropriate to class the site as a corner plot].

- Paragraph 8.25 is misleading regarding the height of the building. A one storey building will be replaced with a five storey building. The proposal is out of character in terms of context, height and the uninterrupted long façade.
(OFFICER RESPONSE): The height of the building and its overall suitability is fully considered in Paragraphs 8.25 and 8.26.
- The pre-application advice said that rooftop children's play space is unacceptable. Why is it now acceptable?
[OFFICER RESPONSE): The applicant has demonstrated that the proposed play space area is large enough to comply with policy requirements. Officers recognise that further details will need to be submitted by condition to ensure that safety and security issues are fully addressed]
- The pre-application advice said that all units should be dual aspect. 50% of units are not dual aspect.
(OFFICER RESPONSE) This is fully assessed in Paragraph 8.33 of the officer's report. 20 out of 33 units are dual aspect (60%) and a further 11 have a secondary window contained in a side elevation opening onto the private amenity space.
- The pre-application advice said that single aspect north facing units are not acceptable. Three are proposed. Why is this now acceptable?
(OFFICER RESPONSE) This is fully assessed in Paragraph 8.33 of the officer's report. The north facing single aspect units would all overlook the recreation ground (which is designated as Green Belt – and likely to remain as such for the foreseeable future). These units would therefore enjoy an uninterrupted outlook – which was a consideration when determining the acceptability of such arrangements. Single aspect units are not fundamentally unacceptable – and one needs to access the quality of accommodation on a case by case basis – which has been the adopted approach.
- The pre-application advice said that 4 parking spaces are below the design standards as not wide enough. Why is this now acceptable?
(OFFICERS RESPONSE): The 4 parking bays along the access drive are 2m wide. Manual for Streets guidance states that parallel parking bays can be 2m wide. The driver using these spaces would be able to access and leave their vehicles and passengers could leave the vehicle within the site prior to it being parked. This layout would not result in any severe impacts on highway safety and is appropriate.
- Paragraph 8.15 refers to 1-2 Barrowsfield being semi-detached built between 1987 – 1912. The building was originally a single dwelling built in 1908 and later subdivided. There is a lot of local objection to its demolition.
(OFFICER RESPONSE): The report contains a typo and should say '1887' instead of 1987. The report does not say that the building was constructed as a semi-detached pair and Paragraph 8.15 goes on to refer to its subdivision. Whilst local objection to the buildings demolition is noted, the report clearly identifies why the Council cannot refuse the application for this reason.
- Paragraph 8.18 does not talk about the site in the context to the buildings on the western side of Limpsfield Road for which there is no justification.

[OFFICER RESPONSE): The context on the western side of Limpsfield Road is described in Paragraph 8.17].

- Paragraph 8.40 refers to neighbouring impact. The building is 2m from the side boundary. 7 flats directly overlook the driveway of Barrowsfield. The driveway provides entrance to 16 flats, cycle storage for the whole development, refuse storage and inadequate boundary treatment. This will harm the privacy of properties on Barrowsfield. The boundary treatment along Barrowsfield should be a solid 1.8m high fence.

(OFFICER RESPONSE): In paragraph 8.41 the report states that the building is 2m from the boundary with 1 Barrowsfield. The access driveway to the dwellings on Barrowsfield is not a private space. It is readily visible within the public realm. Therefore the proposals facing this access road do not cause any harm to privacy. Whilst full details of boundary treatment is to be secured by condition, officers to not consider that the site should be visually screened from Barrowsfield by a solid fence.