

Planning Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 19 October 2017 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, Pat Clouder, Jason Perry,
Joy Prince, Wayne Trakas-Lawlor, Sue Winborn and Chris Wright
- Also Present:** Councillors Jane Avis, Alison Butler, Patricia Hay-Justice, O'Connell, Pat Ryan
and John Wentworth
Steve O'Connell (GLA Member)
- Apologies:** Councillors Luke Clancy and Bernadette Khan

PART A

166/17 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 5 October be signed as a correct record subject to the revised minute for Item 5.4 (17/02952/PRE) circulated within the Addendum.

167/17 **Disclosure of Interest**

There were no disclosures of a pecuniary interest not already registered.

168/17 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

169/17 **Development presentations**

There were no development presentations.

170/17 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

Application 17/02166/FUL had been referred for consideration by the Planning Sub-Committee at the meeting held on 5 October 2017.

Councillors Chatterjee, Perry, Winborn and Wright recused themselves from consideration of this item having explained that the property is owned by their political group and they wished to avoid the risk of a perception of bias were they to take part in the discussions and vote on this matter.

Erection of 1 two storey three bedroom detached house and 1 two storey detached two bedroom house at rear fronting Purley Rise.
Ward: Coulsdon West

In response to Member questions officers confirmed that none of the trees on the site were subject to Tree Preservation Orders and so consideration had been given to maintaining the character of the mature garden and hedging. It was stated that there was a clear desire to maintain the trees on the public highways and officers were satisfied they could be maintained.

The Committee noted that the character of Purley Rise had been evolving with more contemporary designed houses further down the road with officers suggesting that there was a mixed character emerging.

In response to Member questions, officers confirmed that the proposal was for a car free development with the courtyards intended to be amenity spaces for the properties. This had been considered acceptable due to the proximity of the site to Purley District Centre.

Mr Tom Vincent (Granit Architects) spoke as the agent, on behalf of the applicant, and addressed the following:

- The development would create two new family units in the area;
- There was an established precedent for development to the rear of Brighton Road;
- The applicants had worked with the Council throughout the process;
- An abrocultural assessment had been undertaken which had influenced the proposed layout of the site and lost trees would be replaced;
- The street scene was varied; and
- The design took into consideration the topography of the site so the two storeys would appear as one and half storeys, and the timber cladding and green roof would embed the development into the site.

Some Members noted the contemporary design of the development and the additional housing that would be provided. Furthermore, it was noted that the development was proposed to be car free.

Other Members expressed concerns in regards to the proposal as it was felt that while the design was interesting it did not address the street scene and gave the impression of two large garden sheds rather than houses. It was suggested that the approach taken at 48 Purley Rise would have been more appropriate and would have created a positive addition to the street scene rather than, what was considered, an attempt to hide the houses. The Committee stated that they were in favour of additional housing, making the site a car free development and that trees would be protected or replaced. However it was stated that the proposals should be reviewed to create a development which would sit within the street scene.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Pat Clouder seconded a motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of

inappropriate form of development, failing to fit comfortably within the street scene and reflect the local character of the area, and the Committee voted 5 in favour, 1 absence, so planning permission was **REFUSED** for development at 36 Brighton Road, Purley CR8 2LG.

171/17 **Planning applications for decision**

172/17 **17/02192/FUL Queens Hotel, 122 Church Road, Upper Norwood, London SE19 2UG**

Demolition of existing buildings to the centre and rear of the site and existing extensions to the roof and the construction of a new spine building including glazed link to part retained mews building, an extension from the southwestern facing elevation of the existing locally listed building, a single storey extension to the restaurant, subterranean accommodation, parking, a swimming pool and servicing space to create a total of 530 hotel rooms and 170 vehicle parking spaces, the re-cladding of the 1970s extension with ground floor canopy, provision of enhanced landscaping across the site including 3 coach parking spaces to the front, formation of a vehicle access and the adaption of existing entrance to the hotel.

Ward: South Norwood

The Committee were informed that the proposal was for a 530 room hotel with new extensions and the re-cladding of the 1970s extension. While the hotel was a locally listed building set within a conservation area there had been a number of extensions and modifications over the years. There was a large amount of screening between the site and the two storey flats to the north and the rear of the property was proposed to be improved.

Officers clarified that vehicle access would be down the side of the building to an underground car park and that the proposed scheme would improve accessibility and safety. With regards to coach parking, three spaces would be provided at the front of the property and there would be a coach management plan for additional parking off site. The Committee were also informed that the proposal would increase the distance from the nearest property from 14 metres to 16 metres.

The proposed development, Members were informed, would be undertaken in phases however to ensure the re-cladding was done not all the rooms could be occupied until completed. Historic England, it was noted, welcomed the amendments to the proposal and was content with the scheme as the massing had been decreased through the application process and the blue canopies would also be removed.

The socio-economic impact of the scheme was the introduction of 100 new jobs and more people using the local district centre.

In response to Member questions officers confirmed that they were content with the security of the site and that no trees would be lost as a new additional

layer of planting would be introduced to improve the screening. Officers confirmed they did not have a CGI of the proposal during the winter months.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the coach parking and were informed that the site would accommodate three coaches parking at the front of the site and that any additional coaches would be allowed to drop off only and would be required to park off site, which would be secured through a legal agreement. Members were assured that it was a common situation for hotels to have off site coach parking agreements and that the proposal would be secured by a legal agreement. Officers stated the agreement would manage the whole process of coach parking and if there was a breach it would be enforced and additionally there was a potential for funding for a residents parking scheme if it was deemed necessary in the future. As part of the management of the parking there would be a car management scheme which would inform all guests of how to access the site and where they were expected to park. Following an assessment of traffic impact it had been deemed that the impact of additional traffic on the road, due to the development, would be negligible. The assessment had been undertaken using historic data from similar sites across the country and a program called 'Tricks'. Officers stated that it was important to understand how guests would arrive to the hotel and that not all guests would arrive by car and the peak time for arrivals and departures were outside normal rush hour times.

The Committee noted that the blue canopy would be removed from the frontage and were informed it would be replaced by a fairly lightweight structure which would allow views through to the hotel. Having a form of storm porch was a fairly standard feature for hotels to enable guests to be covered while waiting for taxis. In addition there would be a small glazed platform to improve accessibility to the hotel and lifts from the car park and to the dining area.

In response to Member questions officers confirmed that the leisure amenities of a swimming pool and gym could only be used in connection with the hotel and could not be hired out privately. The local residents would have been able to make use of the bar if they wished.

Members were informed that a daylight assessment had been undertaken and had found that there would not be any detrimental impact and that maintaining the mews to the rear of the site would facilitate this.

In response to Member questions officers confirmed there had been a number of pre-application meetings and that the developers had spoken to local residents and taken on their suggestions. As such, it was stated, dramatic changes to the scheme had been made including maintaining the mews, improved privacy for the residents of Wakefield Gardens and increased car parking provision. In response Members queried whether guests would have free parking in the car park and how it would be managed to stop guests driving down adjacent roads even if it was resident only parking. Officers stated that parking fees may be imposed by the hotel however all guests

would be informed at the time of booking that parking was not available on the surrounding roads.

Members noted that the design concept was to have two simple wings that did not detract from the historic central building and were informed that Historic England were happy with the proposal to modify the 1970s extensions and for specialist officers in the Council to take the lead of advising on the design. The palate of materials and the relatively simple approach, it was felt, would make a positive contribution and would respect the original building. Officers were confident that the proposal would make a vast improvement on the current building, would reintroduce the sense of symmetry from the front and the proposed materials would showcase the historic façade.

The Committee noted that the policy was for hotels with over 50 beds should be in district centres and were informed that officers had reviewed this and considered this application acceptable given that it was already a large hotel.

Members queried the maximum tenancy for guests and were informed that it would be 90 days, however following correspondence from resident group's solicitors the agent was willing to accept in principle the five conditions outlined within the addendum.

Mr Philip Goddard (Norwood Society) and Mr David King (Fitzroy Wakefield Action Group) spoke in objection and raised the following issues:

- Welcomed an improved hotel but felt the proposals were for a too large a development and were not appropriate;
- Would create one of the largest hotels in London, and such a hotel would normally service an airport, transport hub or a large entertainment venue;
- During consultation with local residents the applicant had stated that the size of the hotel could not be negotiated;
- There would be increased traffic causing congestion and pollution;
- Parking issues experienced by residents would increase;
- The area only had a PTAL 2/3 rating;
- There would be a five storey element of the development which would back onto a residential property and obscuring windows did not solve overlooking;
- The development was more than three times the density than would be acceptable for a residential development;
- Site was within a conservation area with historic buildings in the area;
- The proposal did not respect the historic local area and the massing was too large;
- The proposals was oversized;
- One storey reduction and recladding the 1970s extension did not compensate for the increased size and impact on the area;
- The hotel was already a mix of different styles and an additional style would have further detrimental impact;
- The bronze and aluminium materials would not be complementary; and

- The London Plan stated that visitor accommodation should be in town centres and as such a large hotel should be located in the centre of Croydon and not at this location.

Mr Richard Quelch (Planner, GVA) spoke as the agent, on behalf of the applicant and addressed the following:

- Client owns a number of hotels which it is refurbishing and is a nationally recognised hotel chain. There was already an agreement with Best Western;
- Objective is to upgrade the hotel;
- Much of the character of the building had been lost due to previous extensions;
- Historic England, GLA and Council officers agreed that the key heritage aspect was the central building which would be retained;
- The 1970s extension would be reclad;
- The burnt down building would be replaced;
- There would be a new landscaping scheme;
- Responded to Member feedback and public consultation;
- No objections from Historic England;
- Committed to working with the local community and a Community Forum had been set up;
- There would be a dedicated liaison group during the redevelopment;
- The proposal would create a branded hotel with improved facilities;
- Over 100 new jobs would be created which would be locally sourced;
- Increased parking provision in the scheme;
- Improved coach parking; and
- There would be payments by the applicant towards infrastructure improvements.

Councillor Patsy Cummings, as the ward councillor, raised the following issues:

- Most talked about issue across the whole ward during by-election campaign;
- Crystal Palace was unique and bordered five boroughs and objections had been received from representatives across the borough boundary;
- Over 300 residents were part of an action group who were opposed to such a large development;
- Parking and traffic issues were already experienced with the current hotel which was expected to worsen with the proposal;
- Concerns were raised as to whether resident concerns had been taken into account, in particular in regards to parking;
- Support for improving the property but the proposal was considered to be overdevelopment;
- Residents would not be able to enjoy their local area if the development went ahead as it was not an appropriate development for the area;
- There would be rooms without windows which was not appropriate;
- Lack of confidence in the proposed disabled access;
- The quality of the design was questioned; and

- Proposals for community engagement after the Planning Committee meeting was considered inadequate.

Steve O'Connell, as the GLA representative, raised the following issues:

- Objectors to the application were cross border and cross Party, and were supported by the local MP;
- The application was 'preposterous';
- The massing and density were out of character and would have a negative impact on the neighbourhood;
- The coach parking plan would not work and would not be enforceable;
- While the applicant had increased the volume of parking on the site it was above the Mayor's recommended level and so may be revised down by the GLA;
- Issues of on street parking was already experienced;
- The size of the hotel would be expected in a town centre, not on the edge of a district centre;
- The PTAL rating was low for the area and the nearest train station was quite a distance away;
- The local community would not be able to make use of the leisure facilities;
- An extra 100 jobs for local people was welcomed but they were unlikely to use public transport;
- The design was not a positive contribution to the local area;
- A post Planning Committee forum was unacceptable; and
- Increased air pollution would be experienced.

The Head of Development Management noted that there had been a high level of local interest including across the borough, but stressed that it was for the Planning Committee to ensure compliance and that the development was in accordance with planning policies. The Committee were informed that the number of objections was not a consideration, however the comments raised and the material considerations were relevant to the Committee decision.

Officers noted that there had previously problems with the hotel, however there was a comprehensive plan including rebranding the hotel which would be of a benefit to the local area. The Committee were informed the applicant had engaged and responded positively to a number of points raised by councillors at the Pre-Application meeting, and the applicant had stated it wanted to continue to engage with Members and the local community.

The Head of Development Management stated there had been a number of unfortunate extensions in the past, but that it was felt that the application provided for quality extensions which would relate to current fabric of the building and would have a positive impact and would contrast well with the historic elements.

The Committee were further informed that the Section 106 agreement would ensure a coach parking management plan, which was a tested process across London. The phasing of the development would be linked to the Section 106 agreement and would ensure that important elements of the

scheme were delivered, such as the re-cladding of the 1970s extension. Furthermore, the GLA had supported the scheme at Stage 1 and had noted that it was an important site for a hotel and the development could enhance the local area.

Members noted that a site visit had given them a good idea of the site and how the development would work alongside how the hotel functioned currently. It was stated that the current market for the hotel was young students who stayed in small sub-terrain rooms for around three days, and that up to 10 or 11 coaches could arrive daily. It was further noted that the rear of the current property was a mess and that the application sought to address that.

Some Members stated that the proposed scheme would be overbearing to the properties on Fitzroy Gardens, furthermore the site was within a conservation area and it was queried whether the scheme would be an improvement to the area as it would create a larger mass with two large extensions. While it was stated the cladding would improve the appearance of the hotel the extension to the left of the central element should not be considered as it was not in keeping with the design.

Concerns were also raised in regards to how busy Church Road was presently and that any additional traffic movements would negatively impact the areas, and that residents should not have to suffer further. With a PTAL rating of 2/3 and the rail station some distance away it was suggested by some Members that majority of visitors would arrive by car or coach and as such there would be a negative impact.

Some Members felt that that the applicant had had an opportunity to create a proper development that was in keeping with the local area, but that the application would create a dominant building that would worsen residents' lives and did not enhance the local area. It was felt that it was the wrong area for such a development. The only benefits, it was stated, were the additional jobs and the re-cladding of the extension.

Other Members of the Committee stated that the extension to the left of the central building would reinstate symmetry to the Church Road frontage which was to be welcomed and did not feel that the massing was too much for the site. While the hotel was in a conservation area it noted that the current building detracted for this and the application would enhance the area. In addition, Members suggested that the recladding would give a more residential feel to the site as the current hotel was considered office like in appearance. Members stated they understood the concerns of residents in regards to traffic, however officers who had studied the data suggested the impact on traffic would be negligible.

It was noted that there had been a number recommendations at the Pre-Application stage and Members noted that a number of them had been implemented in the application and that consultation with residents had taken place. Croydon was a growing town, and the need for hotels was noted. Some

Members stated that the impact of an increased hotel was to be mitigated by having a large underground car park and the removal of some roof extensions.

The Chair stated that it was a challenging application as it was already a large hotel that was in area predominantly residential in nature, and so the use of a large hotel on the site was well established. The socio-economic benefits of the development were considered and it was felt that there would be economic benefit to the local district centre. A modern interpretation and neutral extension would, it was stated, help make the centre of the frontage a landmark which was felt to be the right approach. The scale of the rear, however, was considered to be more challenging but would be similar in scale to current buildings and would not overlook or shadow gardens. Furthermore, the windows were to be partially obscured minimising the impact further.

Parking provision was discussed and some Members stated there was a lot of parking the area and could not foresee a significant negative impact. Additionally, parking and access to the site had been considered and a coach parking management plan would be enforced.

The Chair noted there had previously been problems with the hotel but that positive steps had been made to improve relations with local residents, and following consultation the applicant had agreed to retain the mews. It was challenging but positive development for the town centre, that some Members felt would not have a negative impact on local residents.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Chris Wright proposed and Councillor Wayne Trakas-Lawlor seconded **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of overdevelopment, massing, detrimental impact on the conservation area and impact of parking within the local area, and the Committee voted 6 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **REFUSED** for development at Queens Hotel, 122 Church Road, Upper Norwood, London SE19 2UG.

A second motion for **APPROVAL**, proposed by Councillor Joy Prince and seconded by Councillor Humayun Kabir, thereby fell.

173/17 **17/03709/FUL Rees House/Morland Lodge and 6 Morland Road, Croydon CR0 6NA**

The Committee reconvened at 9.13pm.

Demolition of existing buildings & erection of a part four/part five storey building to create a 1200 place (900 pupils & 300 6th Form Post-16 Pupils) six form entry secondary school with associated access and landscaping (incorporating a roof top multi use games area (MUGA))
Ward: Addiscombe

The Committee were informed that the site had been identified as a site for a secondary school in the emerging Local Plan. A survey had been undertaken that had found there was sufficient on street parking in the surrounding area,

however there were six bus stops within the vicinity of the site and it was anticipated that pupils would arrive via sustainable transport methods. The survey of on street parking had taken place during pick up and drop off times. Members were further informed that Transport for London (TfL) had been consulted and were satisfied that the proposed school would have a limited impact on bus capacity, however if additional capacity was required then there was a commitment between TfL and the Department for Transport.

In response to Member questions the officer confirmed that the MUGA would be floodlit, but due to it being set down on the roof Environmental Health officers were satisfied that it would not have a negative impact on the surrounding area. Officers stated that no additional pedestrian crossings were proposed, however there would be active management of the access to the school and that there was not sufficient space for more disabled parking spaces to be provided on the site.

The Committee noted that the school would aim for a bronze level Travel Plan which it did not feel was aspirational considering its location, and that only half of the expected amount of cycling parking would be provided. Officers responded stating that the applicant had highlighted areas where additional cycle storage could be provided in a phased manner and that it could be included within the conditions that the school should aspire to achieve a gold level Travel Plan.

In response to Member questions regarding landscaping, officers confirmed that it was intended that there would be a mix of high and low landscaping and that if trees 14 and 16 could not be retained then they would be replaced by semi-mature trees. The Committee were further informed that an air quality assessment had been undertaken and reviewed by officers who were satisfied with the assessment.

Ms Azra Ibrisimbegovic and Mr Brad Grisdale spoke in objection and raised the following issues:

- The design of the building made it appear like a prison;
- The playground was not of a sufficient size;
- Doesn't meet safety standards as students and staff would need to go out into the road during a fire alarm and emergency services would be unable to access the school;
- The proposal only just met inside recreational standards and not outdoor standards;
- Mediocre design for students;
- Appreciate the need for more school places but the proposal was too large for the site;
- Residents already experienced problems with accessing their private car parks and feared this would increase with staff using the car park;
- There was not sufficient on street parking in the area; and
- The road was very busy and would be unsafe for students.

Mr Alan Gunne-Jones (Managing Director, PDA) and Mr James Tatham (Architect, Jestico & Whiles) spoke in support and addressed the following:

- The applicants had worked with the Council to resolve the technical issues and had reviewed the issues raised by residents and had attempted to resolve them all;
- TfL and the Council were content with the technical review;
- The architects had worked closely with the provider and planning officers and it had been taken to the Place Review Panel. It was considered to improve the public realm;
- More gold cladding and recess windows had been introduced following feedback from the Committee at the Pre-Application stage;
- A consultant had reviewed the fire safety plans; and
- The school provider had a number of other schools which had all received Good or Outstanding Ofsted reviews.

Officers informed the Committee that the outdoor standards were National Government guidelines rather than regulations, and that fire escapes was a matter for Building Control and was not planning matter.

The Committee recognised the need for more secondary school places in the borough and considered the proposal to be well designed for the tight site. The proposal for the MUGA to be set down on the roof was noted as a good design element, and that the external design had been improved and would be an improvement on the current derelict buildings on the site.

Members stated the school should aim for a gold Travel Plan and addition cycle provision should be provided on site to encourage sustainable modes of transport. The 200m exclusion zone around the school, however, was noted as an element that would need careful monitoring alongside whether any additional crossings were needed along the road.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Jamie Audsley proposed and Councillor Pat Clouder seconded the officer's recommendation, and the Committee voted unanimously in favour, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at Rees House/Moorland Lodge and 6 Moorland Road, Croydon CR0 6NA.

174/17 17/02166/FUL 36 Brighton Road, Purley CR8 2LG

The planning application was considered as an item referred by the Planning Sub-Committee, as above.

175/17 Other planning matters

There were none.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....

