

## Planning Committee

Meeting of Croydon's Planning Committee held on Thursday, 15 July 2021 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

This meeting was Webcast – and is available to view via the Council's Web Site

### MINUTES

**Present:** Councillor Chris Clark (Chair);  
Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Vice-Chair);  
Councillors Joy Prince, Clive Fraser, Humayun Kabir, Jamie Audsley,  
Scott Roche, Ian Parker and Michael Neal (In place of Lynne Hale)

**Also Present:** Councillor Luke Clancy and Stuart King

**Apologies:** Councillor Gareth Streeter

### PART A

82/21 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 1 July 2021 be signed as a correct record.

83/21 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

84/21 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

85/21 **Development presentations**

86/21 **21/02453/PRE 121 Canterbury Road, Croydon, CR0 3HH**

Demolition of buildings and erection of a building with heights ranging between four and eight storeys to provide 93 residential units. Associated parking and landscaping, along with a public footway/cycle route through the site.

Ward: Broad Green

Clara Blagden from Icen Projects (Planning Consultant), Nick Lawrence from Aitch Group (Applicant), Chris Levett from DLA Architecture (Architect), Oliver Mckay from Studio Bosk (Landscape Architect), Ian McKenna from Hollis (Daylight/Sunlight Consultant) and Lucy Williams from Icen Projects (Townscape) all 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 at this meeting were as follows:

**Residential redevelopment of site** – Members addressed the importance of making the most of sites was noted though developments needed to be responsive to context and of a certain quality, although the improvements over the existing building were noted.

**Height** – There was a mixed response from Members to the massing of the scheme; some members suggested that 8 storeys was too high, with the massing at the front being prominent and would be the tallest building in the area. Some Members suggested that the massing was acceptable given corner and gateway of the site. The improvements since the Place Review Panel comments were noted. Further analysis or justification could be helpful as some Members suggested that the massing could be acceptable if there was a high quality design and appearance, and delivered good levels of affordable housing and cycling and pedestrian improvements.

**Design** – The Committee suggested that the architectural design and integration of different parts of the buildings could be further developed and could match the quality of a gateway site and should add to the local area with further work suggested especially around materiality, street level and detail.

- Active frontages needed to be carefully considered and other uses such as a café, health centre or other active uses were suggested. The community use rooms welcomed by Members.
- The scheme should provide for fully accessible units and meet the London Plan standards in this respect.
- There was a discussion around how balconies and winter gardens would work in practice, especially in terms of maintenance.
- The security and the importance of defensible space was highlighted by Members specifically at ground floor level and also the security of the deck access areas.
- The importance of biodiversity and having a good urban greening factor as possible being achieved was discussed.
- Members suggested that it was important to ensure cycle storage was at sufficient numbers and appropriately designed; as well as the importance of meeting air quality standards which was highlighted given the site's context, and electric vehicle charging points should also be provided including for disabled bays.

**Affordable housing provision** – The delivery of affordable housing was noted to be of significant importance and should meet policy requirements of

at least 30% (60:40 split) as a minimum and should deliver true social rent levels. Also the importance of having a registered provider on board at this stage reinforced to ensure needs were met and further design changes were not needed.

**Cycle** – Cycle and pedestrian route was generally welcomed by Members and the segregated design was considered appropriate, though further work suggested around the integration of this route into the wider network and future improvements in the local area and to clarify maintenance proposals. Additionally, the Lombard roundabout improvements for cycling/pedestrian users was advocated for, especially given heavy use with three local schools and significant development in the immediate area. A proposal for a "Cambridge style" roundabout was discussed although it was noted this would require TfL approval given the status of the road network.

**Other** – Members addressed the importance of consultation with local residents, businesses and community groups and to engage as helpfully as responsible to generate a community response to the emerging design.

Ward Councillor Stuart King addressed to the Committee his local viewpoints of the application.

The presentation was welcomed with the opportunity to provide feedback which was helpful by Members and it was welcomed that the scheme would be encouraged to come forward, responding to the issues raised.

The Chair thanked the developers for their presentation.

#### 87/21 **Planning applications for decision**

*There was nine Members present during this Committee meeting, as outlined above. The voting therefore was recorded to reflect the nine Members present and not ten Members as mentioned on the webcast.*

#### 88/21 **20/05575/FUL 16 Smitham Downs Road, Purley CR8 4NB**

Demolition of existing dwelling, erection of a 3/4 storey building comprising 9 flats with basement car parking, landscaping and amenity space.

Ward: Purley and Woodcote

The officers presented details of the planning application and responded to questions for clarification.

Mr Devendra Paramasvaran spoke in objection to the application.

The Committee deliberated on the application presentation heard before them having heard all the speakers who addressed the Committee, and in turn addressed their view on the matter.

The substantive motion to **GRANT** the application based on the officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Clive Fraser. This motion was not seconded.

Councillor Humayan Kabir proposed a motion to **DEFER** the application on the grounds of the proposed brickwork being out of keeping with the character of the area; the pinch point to the neighbouring properties; and for improved security of amenity space and play space and amount/levels of amenity space. This was seconded by Councillor Lelia Ben-Hassel.

The motion to defer was taken to a vote and carried with seven Members voting in favour and two Members abstained their vote.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to **DEFER** the application for the development at 16 Smitham Downs Road, Purley, CR8 4NB.

89/21 **20/05370/FUL 5 Smitham Downs Road, Purley**

Demolition of existing dwelling, the construction of a part 4/part 5 storey residential building accommodating 20 flats, all together with vehicular accesses from Smitham Downs Road and The Vale, vehicle and cycle parking, refuse provision and associated hard and soft landscaping.

Ward: Coulsdon Town

The officers presented details of the planning application and responded to questions for clarification.

Ms Alexandra Collins spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Andy Hollins the applicant's agent spoke in support of the application.

The referring Ward Member Councillor Luke Clancy spoke at committee against the application.

The Committee deliberated on the application presentation heard before them having heard all the speakers who addressed the Committee, and in turn addressed their view on the matter.

The substantive motion to **GRANT** the application based on the officer's recommendation was not supported by the Committee.

Councillor Ian Parker proposed a motion to **REFUSE** the application on the grounds of height, size and massing creating an overdevelopment form which is out of character in the area; lighting impact on neighbours and the quality of

.....  
accommodation to specific units for future occupiers regarding amenity space sizes. This was seconded by Councillor Scott Roche.

The motion to refuse was taken to a vote and carried with eight Members voting in favour and one Member abstained their vote.

The Committee **RESOLVED** to **REFUSE** the application for the development at 5 Smitham Downs Road, Purley.

90/21 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

91/21 **Other planning matters**

92/21 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

The report was received for information.

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:** .....