

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 24/02/2022

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Part 4 of the Agenda is “Planning applications for decision”.

The following items within Part 4 are incorrectly described as being within Part 5 on the agenda reports and labelled as items 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, and should instead be labelled items 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 respectively.

Item 4.1 – 51 Addiscombe Road, CR0 6SB

One additional representation was received from Windrush Housing Association (the Applicant) setting out the history of the registered social housing provider, its company structure including the existence of a Croydon office and details of who the provider aims to support.

Paragraph 6.1 of the Officer Report states that MP Chris Philip is noted as an objector. This is a typo and incorrect – MP Chris Philp did not comment on the application.

Under the list of proposed conditions, condition 7 should read ‘adherence and compliance with the fire statement’

Item 4.2 - 66 Foxley Lane, Purley, CR8 3EE

At paragraph 6.1 of the report, it should be clarified that at the time the officer report was written, 15 responses (all objections), not 14, had been received. These are all summarised in the officer report, and no additional representations have been received.

At paragraph 7.2 it should be clarified that the NPPF was updated in July 2021 (not February).

Item 4.3 - 53 Homefield Road, CR5 1ET

Since the publication of the report 2 additional representations have been received. Both are objections, but neither raise any additional points which are not already covered in the committee report.

Additionally, a further representation has been received from Cllr Birt regarding rights of way/ownership of access and notice served of neighbouring properties by the applicant. These comments have been addressed in the committee report.

To clarify, once comments were raised in regards to the notification of neighbours the applicant was made aware and asked to review their submission.

It was recognised by the applicant that an error had been made with their submission and that notice would be served on 53a, neighbours would be notified and a notice placed in the local paper. From a planning perspective notice has been served in accordance with the requirements. In regards to the rights of access over the access road, this is a civil matter and not a material planning consideration. Although, it is noted that the development site at No.53 has an existing garage located to the rear of the existing building which is only accessible from the access road and has been in place for over ten years (and the proposed development would have one parking space at the rear).

At paragraph 7.2 it should be clarified that the NPPF was updated in July 2021 (not February).