

Planning Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 7 December 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, Sherwan Chowdhury, Luke Clancy,
Bernadette Khan, Jason Perry, Sue Winborn, Richard Chatterjee and
Maggie Mansell

Also Present: Councillors Michael Neal, Andy Stranack and Lynne Hale

Apologies: Councillor Joy Prince

PART A

A206/17 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2017 be signed as a correct record.

A207/17 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

A208/17 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

A209/17 **Development presentations**

There were none.

A210/17 **Planning applications for decision**

A211/17 **6.1 16/02577/P Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road, South Croydon CR2 7AR**

Demolition of existing hotel; erection of a two/three storey building with accommodation in roofspace comprising 10 one bedroom, 16 two bedroom and 3 three bedroom flats (29 flats); provision of 25 car parking spaces at rear with access off Whitmead Close and associated refuse storage and cycle storage
Ward: Croham

Members raised questions about the amount of community space, a designated children's play area, parking overprovision and disabled bays.

Officers explained that there was a substantial area of community space within the grounds but no designated children's play area. At the present time, there is no policy requirement but there could be a condition identifying an area for children's play space.

Mr Paul Waddell spoke in objection, representing Witney Close residents, and raised the following concerns:

- Dozens of Witney Close residents feel this development will have an unacceptable impact on local residents
- The size of the development will dominate the skyline – it is an overdevelopment
- Residents would support a more sympathetic development
- Flats with higher balconies will overlook Witney Close
- TPOs - provide huge amenity value and screen residents in Witney Close - removal would impact
- Witney Close is a small estate with 36 properties and it is heavily parked
- Access on Normanton Road rather than Witney Close would be preferable
- It is a pity it is for residential not educational development, as there is a lack of school places in the area

Mr Donal Farrelly (Senior Planner, Stiles Harold Williams Partnership LLP) spoke as the agent, on behalf of the applicant and highlighted the following points:

- The demolition of the hotel will be replaced by residential
- Affordable housing viability was carried out and agreed – it is supported and meets planning policy
- The car park will incorporate boundary treatment
- There is adequate parking in the local area
- Ecological survey was done and appropriate mitigation taken to safeguard protected species

Councillor Michael Neal, ward Member for Croham, spoke in objection, on behalf of local residents and made the following points:

- It is an overdevelopment
- It will have a detrimental impact on residents in Witney Close and Normanton Road
- Parking in the area is at a premium
- The rear car park will impact on neighbouring properties
- There is concern about TPO trees
- The loss of trees (18) and hedgerows is detrimental to the area
- There needs to be a condition to ensure tree planting will replace the loss of trees

He asked the Committee to refuse on the grounds of noise, disturbance and overlooking.

The Director of Planning & Strategic Transport highlighted that the development as policy compliant, included 13 family units and the design was well considered. Any concerns about validation of certificates for the planning application should be taken up with the planning department but were not for this Committee to consider.

Members raised the following issues:

- It is clearly a development site
- The impact of parking and access at the rear will have a detrimental impact with the loss of trees
- Access to public transport is not good in this area and the site is at the top of a fairly steep hill
- This is a bigger site than most of the other sites developed in the area and a residential development will help towards meeting housing need
- All grade A and B trees will be retained.
- There is a significant buffer between existing residents in Witney Close and the new proposal.
- The primary school has not come forward to say they want to use part of the land.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Jason Perry proposed and Councillor Richard Chatterjee seconded **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of overdevelopment by dint of size and massing, the impact on adjoining occupiers in Witney Close and the loss of opportunity for school provision in the future, and the Committee voted 4 in favour, 6 against, so this motion thereby fell.

The Committee then voted on a second motion for **APPROVAL**, proposed by Councillor Paul Scott and seconded by Councillor Bernadette Khan, 6 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at Normanton Park Hotel, 34-36 Normanton Road, South Croydon CR2 7AR.

A212/17 **6.3 17/03889/FUL 59 Upper Shirley Road, Croydon CR0 5HE**

Demolition of existing dwelling: erection of three storey building comprising 7 two bedroom flats and 2 three bedroom detached houses at rear formation of vehicular access and provision of associated parking, bicycle and refuse storage facilities

Ward: Waddon

Members questioned the character of the area, the height of the building and the lack of community space.

Officers explained that there are several large family houses in the immediate vicinity but the wider area has had recent permissions for flatted developments, so there is a mixture of character. The properties fronting the street have entrances onto the street, but most of the flats are accessed from the side. Amenity space is provided by recessed balconies. Although there is no private space, there is space at the front, which could be conditioned to be private for unit 1.

There was some discussion around the PTAL (public transport access links). Currently, as the PTAL increases, the London Plan seeks higher density. However, the new London Plan is challenging the whole issue of the density matrix - whether it is helpful or should be looked at in a different way.

Mr Clive Higgins, a local resident, spoke in objection and raised the following concerns:

- His rear garden is the other side of the rear boundary of the development and will cause loss of privacy and adverse intrusion
- Balconies are overlooking without screening
- The car park is close to the garden, which will cause noise, disturbance and light intrusion into bedrooms at night
- 4 large oak trees plus others will be removed and there is no requirement for more trees

Mr Yussuf Mwanza (MZA Planning) spoke as the agent, on behalf of the applicant and highlighted the following points:

- It is a high quality, sustainable scheme
- It complies with housing standards

Councillor Andy Stranack, ward Member for Heathfield, spoke in objection, on behalf of local residents and made the following points:

- There is a significant amount of concern amongst local residents
- Residents recognise the need for additional housing and are not opposing the development but highlighting areas of greatest concern
- The rear garden of no.39 will face lounges and kitchens looking onto bedrooms - a higher level of screening around first floor balconies is needed
- During the construction period there are concerns about disruption and danger to pupils at Coloma School. The bus stop is directly opposite the entrance to the site and there is very little parking restriction along the road, so the site will be dangerous

He recommended the Committee to defer the application in order to visit the site.

The Director of Planning & Strategic Transport summarised as follows:

- It is an efficient use of land, providing family homes.
- It will safeguard the green belt.
- It is in keeping as there is varied character in the area.
- Under the new London Plan, it is proposed to get rid of the density matrix.
- Any overlooking is considered appropriate in an urban setting.
- Regarding highways impact, the bus stop is on the opposite side of the road and highway officers are satisfied that impact on the highway is negligible.

Members raised the following issues:

- Overlooking – although reasonable distances separate the development from the property at the rear (20 metres), there is scope for semi-obscured glass in the balustrade to the rear.
- A landscaping condition would ensure sufficient screening by the car parking – maybe a fence
- A management plan should ensure there is no conflict during construction
- Parking within the site is welcome

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Humayun Kabir proposed and Councillor Paul Scott seconded the officer's recommendation and the Committee voted 6 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 59 Upper Shirley Road, Croydon CR0 5HE.

A second motion for **DEFERRAL**, for a site visit to look at highways issues, parking and density, proposed by Councillor Richard Chatterjee and seconded by Councillor Luke Clancy, thereby fell.

A213/17 **6.4 17/04484/FUL 232 Pampisford Road, South Croydon CR2 6DB**

Demolition of existing building and erection of two storey building with part basement and accommodation in roof space comprising of 6 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom flats. Formation of 7 car parking spaces, cycle and refuse stores
Ward: Heathfield

Members asked about amenity space, boundary treatment and parking layout at the front.

Officers responded that there are balconies and space outside. There are conditions for boundary treatment and landscaping but no condition to restrict access from Haling Grove.

The parking layout is covered under Condition 2 and could be altered.

Mr Reg Heller, a resident of Gulliver Court, spoke in objection and raised the following concerns:

- Parking area - part of Pampisford Road narrows there and, during school time, people park right the way down the side road.
- Concern - additional parking spaces will cause more problems
- Bus past Regina Coelis School - people park on the road causing traffic congestion
- It is the worst place to put a block of flats due to the narrowness of the road
- There are too many developments in Pampisford Road
- Amenity space – is it enough?

Mr Richard Ibbett (architect) spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following points:

- It is a high quality, sustainable scheme

- The design has sought to harmonise with neighbouring properties
- There are gardens at the front and general amenity space at the rear
- The proposal has been reduced in scale and access improved
- There have been a lot of objections, all from Gulliver Court, but most of the parking problems are around school opening and closing hours
- No objections were received from flats either side of the site

The Director of Planning & Strategic Transport commented that this proposal will provide 9 additional units - all family-sized. The scale and massing matches neighbouring properties. There is good spacing either side and one-to-one parking provision. Highways officers are satisfied with parking and access.

Members commented as follows:

- It is a well designed scheme, fitting in with the character of the area
- It is probably not appropriate to have access at the rear
- There are concerns about the amenity space
- There is an issue about parking around school times

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Jamie Audsley seconded the officer's recommendation and the Committee voted 6 in favour, with 4 abstentions, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 232 Pampisford Road, South Croydon CR2 6DB.

A214/17 **6.2 17/03542/FUL 98 Hyde Road, South Croydon CR2 9NQ**

Demolition of existing building, erection of two storey building with basement and accommodation in roof space comprising of 2 x one bedroom and 6 x two bedroom flats. Formation of vehicular access and 8 parking spaces, cycle and refuse storage

Ward: Sanderstead

Planning officers pointed out that 2 extra objections had been received, making a total of 22 objections

Members asked questions about the projection of the building and the refuse area.

Officers explained that the projection was at basement and ground level and hardly made any difference, particularly given the screening. The refuse area has close proximity to the vehicle access.

Mr Yussuf Mwanza (MZA Planning) spoke as the agent, on behalf of the applicant and highlighted the following points:

- The principle of development has already been established
- 6 minor adjustments have been made to the previously approved scheme
- The site will be well screened
- There is an additional parking space and a cycle store

- There are no highways objections

Councillor Lynne Hale, ward Member for Sanderstead, spoke in objection, on behalf of local residents and made the following points:

- The loss of a 2-bed flat is disappointing as there is a need for family accommodation
- This proposal will occupy more of the site
- It is in a high flood risk area
- 45% will be concreted over
- The drawings do not match the descriptions
- The PTAL is given as 5 but is actually 2
- The facts should be checked

Members who did not support approval of the previous scheme still considered it an overdevelopment.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Bernadette Khan seconded the officer's recommendation and the Committee voted 6 in favour, 3 against, with 1 abstention, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 98 Hyde Road, South Croydon CR2 9NQ.

A215/17 Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee

There were none.

A216/17 Other planning matters

There were none.

Committee Clerk retiring

The Chair and Councillor Perry thanked Margot Rohan for her work on the Planning Committee as this was her last Planning Committee, after nearly 15 years at Croydon Council.

The meeting ended at 8.36 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....