Planning Committee

Meeting held on Monday, 18 December 2017 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Humayun Kabir (Vice-Chair);

Councillors Jamie Audsley, Simon Brew, Patsy Cummings, Sherwan Chowdhury, Bernadette Khan, Jason Perry, Joy Prince, Sue Winborn and Chris Wright

Also Present: Councillors Dudley Mead and Steve O'Connell

Apologies: Councillors Paul Scott and Luke Clancy

PART A

A217/17 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

There were no minutes to consider under this item.

A218/17 **Disclosure of Interest**

Councillor Brew disclosed that he lived within 400 yards of the road in which the application at 6.4 was situated.

A219/17 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

A220/17 **Development presentations**

A221/17 **17/02637/PRE Land To The East Of Grosvenor Road, South Norwood, London**

Colm Lacey (Brick by Brick Croydon Ltd), Simon Toplis (HTA Design LLP) and Adam Conchie (Carter Jonas) were in attendance to deliver the presentation and respond to Members' questions and issues raised for

further consideration prior to submission of a planning application. Richard Freeman (Croydon Council) also updated Members on recent developments since the report had been published.

The main issues raised during the discussion were as follows:

- The importance of the ongoing public consultation exercises and the need to respond to issues raised by residents.
- The proposed Community Hub – which was identified as an important part of the development and should be accessible for local use.
- The impact of the scheme to the amenity of existing towers
- The conservation area and therefore the design and architecture of the development respecting this.
- The public realm aspect, particularly in relation to communal areas such as outdoor play spaces.
- Provision of car parking and the impact on green spaces.
- The affordable housing offer

A222/17 **Planning applications for decision**

The Chair moved the order for this item to ensure that applications with registered speakers were heard first.

A223/17 **17/03916/FUL 54 Arkwright Road South Croydon CR2 0LL**

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked questions related to the flood risk to the site and the nature of the consultation for the application. Officers responded that there were conditions in place to ensure necessary steps were taken to mitigate the flood risk. The Committee were assured that a public consultation had taken place and that the statutory requirements had been fulfilled.

Mara Sturt-Penrose, speaking against the application, made the following points:

- The concerns raised by residents in the consultation had been dismissed.
- The application did not demonstrate how local properties would be protected by the impact of the new property.
- Granting of the application would open the floodgates for other such apartment developments in the area and some developers had begun approaching owners of nearby properties to build more flats in the area.

The applicant, Jorge Nash, speaking in favour of the applicant, made the following points:

- Thanked officers for good engagement with the applicant regarding the proposals.
- The external design retained the appearance of a single house and kept the property within the character of the area.
- Balconies and private amenities were provided for each unit and there was provision provided for parking spaces.
- The proposal included landscaping to the front and rear of the property in keeping with the street scheme.
- Windows in the scheme had been designed ensuring privacy was retained.

The Director of Planning and Strategic Transport stated that the national framework required a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Officers were satisfied that the proposal was respectful of existing sight lines and the site was situated a good distance away from other properties.

Councillor Winborn moved to refuse the application, on the basis that the development was out of character with the area and would impact on neighbouring properties. Councillor Perry seconded the motion.

Councillor Khan moved to approve the application. Councillor Audsley seconded the motion.

The first motion was put to the vote and fell with 4 voting in favour and 5 against.

The second motion was put to the vote and was carried with 5 voting in favour and 4 against.
The Committee resolved to **GRANT** the application for development at 54 Arkwright Road CR2 0LL.

A224/17 **17/05104/FUL 45 Old Lodge Lane, Purley CR8 4DL**

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked questions on the provision of parking at the site and officers confirmed that four parking spaces would be provided.

Liz Marsden, speaking in objection, raised the following points:
- There was a shortage of family homes.
- The development would have a negative effect on the area.

Pradnya Vaidya, speaking in objection, raised the following points:
- There would be a loss of privacy to local residents.
- Noise nuisance would increase due to the location of the bins
- There was already significant pressure on parking in the area

Roy Sawh, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- The application was not in keeping with the character of the area.
- The parking provision created was insufficient.
- The development would make the neighbourhood less desirable to live in.

Councillor O'Connell, speaking in objection as Ward Member, raised the following points:

- The development was out of character as there were no flats in the locality.
- Traffic was a problem in the area and there were three schools in the vicinity.
- The access to public transport rating was low.
- The development was too large for the area.

The Director of Planning and Strategic Transport responded with the following points:

- There were additional family units within the development.
- The proposed extensions had been kept within the character of the area – it retained the look of a detached dwelling.
- The development was an adequate distance from neighbours and the plot boundary.
- The parking provision provided for exit onto the highway in forward gear.
- There was a bus stop in close proximity to the area.

Councillor Wright moved a motion of refusal, on the basis that it was an over-development of the site and out of character with the local area.

Councillor Brew seconded the motion for refusal.

Councillor Khan moved a motion of approval and Councillor Audsley seconded the motion.
The motion for refusal was put to the vote and fell with four Members voting in favour and five Members voting against.

The motion for approval was put to the vote and was carried with five Members voting in favour and four Members voting against.

The Committee resolved to **GRANT** the application for development at 45 Old Lodge Lane, Purley CR8 4DL.

A225/17 **17/02918/FUL Land Adjacent 2 West Hill South Croydon CR2 0SA**

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked questions on trees and road safety. Officers present responded that a condition could be added which would include details of the provision of trees as part of the development. The Highways team had been consulted on the development, and officers were satisfied that the development provided for safe access to the road.

At 20.32pm Councillor Chowdhury arrived, and was advised by the Chair that he could not vote on this item as the consideration of the application had already commenced.

The Applicant, Ian Coomber, speaking in favour of the application, made the following points:

- There had been numerous amendments made to the development as part of the pre-application process.
- The development was marketed at local residents looking to downsize, and thus would free up family properties in the area.
- The development was close to Purley and Sanderstead stations and a local bus route.
- Tree protection measures were in place.

Councillor Perry moved a motion that deferred decision of the application until further design work had been undertaken to make the development more within keeping of the surrounding area.
Councillor Wright seconded the motion for deferral.

Councillor Audsley moved a motion for approval of the application. Councillor Khan seconded the motion.

The motion for deferral was put to the vote and fell with four Members voting in favour and five voting against.

The motion for approval was put to the vote and was carried with five Members voting in favour and four voting against.

The Committee resolved to **GRANT** the application for development at 2 West Hill South Croydon CR2 0SA.

A226/17 **17/03814/FUL Earl Of Eldon, 63 Brighton Road, South Croydon CR2 6ED**

Following the officers' presentation, Members asked questions related to car parking and outside amenities. Officers present responded that there was informal parking provision that could accommodate between four to six cars. The access to public transport rating was very high for the site. Each ground floor property had outside amenity space, the upper floor units each had

balcony provision and the unit at the top of the property included a roof terrace.

Councillor Perry moved a motion for refusal on the basis of over-development of the site and lack of parking provision.

Councillor Chowdhury moved a motion for approval, and Councillor Khan seconded the motion.

Councillor Wright seconded the motion for refusal.

The motion for approval was put to the vote with five Members voting in favour and five Members voting against. The Chair used his casting vote in favour of the motion, and therefore the motion was carried, causing the second motion to fall.

The Committee resolved to **GRANT** the application for development at Earl Of Eldon, 63 Brighton Road, South Croydon CR2 6ED.

A227/17 **17/04917/FUL Land R/O 21 Beech Way, South Croydon CR2 8QR**

Following the officers' presentation, Members asked questions related to an archaeological site in the area and waste collection plans. Officers present responded that the area was not an archaeological priority zone and therefore no survey was required at the site. The site had sufficient space for access to refuse vehicles.

During the debate an issue was raised regarding the ecological impact of the proposals. Officers present responded that the lawn was not a species-rich habitant and that most of the hedgerows and trees within the plot would be retained.

An issue regarding the archaeological status of the site was also raised during the debate. Officers present stated that the Historic England mapping software had been consulted and the site did not fall under a priority zone.

Councillor Wright moved a motion for approval with a condition that desktop research be undertaken on the archaeological status of the site.
Councillor Chowdhury seconded the motion.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried with nine Members voting in favour and one against.

The Committee resolved to **GRANT** the application for development at 21 Beech Way, South Croydon CR2 8QR, subject to the following condition:

- That desktop research be undertaken on the archaeological status of the site.

A228/17 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

A229/17 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

The meeting ended at 9.25 pm

Signed:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank