

<p>Report of: Director of Planning and Strategic Transport</p> <p>Author: Nicola Townsend</p>	<p>Title: Weekly Planning Decisions</p>
---	--

1. Purpose

- 1.1 This report provides a list of cases determined (since the last scheduled Planning Committee) providing details of the site and description of development (by Ward), whether the case was determined by officers under delegated powers or by Planning Committee/Sub Committee and the outcome (refusal/approval).

Planning Decisions

- 1.2 Attached as Appendix 1 is the list of Delegated and Planning Committee/Sub Committee decisions taken between 20th July and 31st July 2020.
- 1.4 During this period the service issued 206 decisions (ranging from applications for full planning permission, applications to discharge or vary planning conditions, applications for tree works, applications for prior approval, applications for non-material amendments and applications for Certificates of Lawful Development). 10 applications were withdrawn by applicants (which also appear on the list).
- 1.5 Out of the 196 decisions issued, 42 were refused (21.42%). Therefore the approval rate for last reporting period was 78.58%.
- 1.6 The majority of cases determined during this period were relatively limited in scale and scope. Examples of some of the decisions are listed below:
- On the 20th July 2020 Planning Permission was refused (20/01763/FUL) for the Construction of two storey dwelling on land at rear of existing property with part basement/garage under and formation of new vehicular/pedestrian access to Selcroft Road at land to the rear of 31 Oakwood Avenue. Officers had concerns with a number of aspects of the scheme and it was consequently refused on a variety of grounds. These included concerns regarding the scale, design and siting of the proposal which resulted in a cramped form of development which would have a detrimental impact on the streetscene, it was considered that the development would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. In addition to this the application failed to demonstrate that the off street car parking would not result in highway safety

issues. In addition to this the application did not pay adequate regard to the potential impact it may have on the protected species.

- On the 31st July 2020 planning permission was refused (20/01997/FUL) for alterations including demolition of existing garage; erection of a two storey side extension, a two storey rear extension, a loft conversion with roof lights in the front roof slope and dormers in the rear roof slope, the construction of balconies at first floor and second floor level, the construction of rear basement with terrace area and external staircase. The conversion of single dwelling into 6 flats; provision of car parking, refuse and recycling store, soft landscaping and new vehicular access onto Woodland Way. The application was refused for 3 main reasons. Firstly it was considered that the design and materials of the proposed balconies at first and second floor level would dominate and detract from the appearance of the building and have a negative impact on the street scene of which they would form part. Secondly that the development would result in a poor quality and substandard living accommodation for future residents and finally the development proposed to remove an informal crossing point and there was a lack of information regards pedestrian and vehicular sightlines which was likely to result in potential harm to highway and pedestrian safety.
- On the 23rd July Planning Permission was refused (20/02258/FUL) for the retention of the Public House on the ground floor and creation of an additional storey with rear extensions and associated alterations to provide 4 flats on the upper floors at 116 Orchard Way, Croydon. Officers have significant concerns regarding the proposal and the application was refused for several reasons. Officers considered the extensions to be excessive in size and unsympathetic in their design which resulted in not only harm the character of the building and the wider street scene but they would also cause harm to the amenities to the adjoining occupiers. Concerns were also raised as to the standard of accommodation which would be provided for future occupiers in terms of outlook, access to light, privacy and the amount of amenity space provided. In terms of impact on the highway the application failed to demonstrate that the level of off street parking was adequate and in addition to this inadequate provision was made for refuse and recycling facilities.