

## Planning Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 11 January 2018 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 Luke Clancy, Jason Perry, Joy Prince, Sue Winborn and  
Chris Wright
- Also Present:** Councillor Maria Gatland, Lynne Hale, Stephen Mann and Vidhi Mohan
- Apologies:** Councillor Jamie Audsley, Sherwan Chowdhury and Bernadette Khan

### PART A

#### A1/18 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on 7 December 2017 and 28 December 2017 be signed as a correct record with the amendment that Councillor Chris Wright gave his apologies for the meeting held on 7 December 2017.

#### A2/18 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

#### A3/18 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

#### A4/18 **Development presentations**

#### A5/18 **5.1 17/06247/PRE Queens Hotel, 122 Church Road, Upper Norwood, SE19 2UG**

Presentation of a pre-application scheme for the demolition of existing buildings to the centre and rear of the site and the construction of a new spine building, including glazed link to a retained mews building and the erection of a further extension to the south western facing elevation of the existing locally listed building, to create 495 hotel rooms with 207 car parking spaces (including 13 van spaces), the recladding of the 1970's extension with ground

floor canopy, the provision of landscaping including 3 spaces for the parking of coaches within the forecourt area.

Ward: South Norwood

Richard Quelch (GVA), Katie Cairns (Assael Architecture), and Phillip Rust (SDG) 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 during the discussion were as follows:

- Meaningful consultation with residents needed to take place and details of the outcome of the consultation should be shared
- The reduction in massing was welcomed
- Careful consideration needed to be given to the materials used and the elevational treatment of the proposed extensions (the east-west spine and the Church Road elevation); simplified but still of exemplar quality
- Design of the Church Road extensions requires careful consideration to ensure it complements the historic central façade
- Reduction in proposed number of rooms and increase in parking spaces generally welcomed
- Transport mode estimates were needed to assess the impact
- Clarity on how the developer aimed to encourage hotel guests to use the charged car park as opposed to on street car park
- Some concern over the impact of 5 coach parking spaces proposed within the hotel forecourt
- Linked to the above issue, statement required on how off-site coach parking would be managed and capacity of available sites needs to be further clarified
- Overlooking into surrounding properties – some support for the removal of the previously proposed angled windows
- View that obscured glazing should be avoided if at all possible

A6/18 **Planning applications for decision**

A7/18 **17/03953/FUL Thanet House, Coombe Road**

Alterations to roof, erection of dormer extensions in rear roof slopes and installation of roof-lights to front roof slopes and use of fourth floor (roof-space) as 7x1 bedroom flats, provision of associated refuse and cycle storage.

Ward: Fairfield

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked questions on the impact on Thanet Place as it was a small cul-de-sac. Officers confirmed that residents within Thanet House had submitted an asbestos report, however the control and removal of asbestos fell under separate legislation. It

was recommended that a condition be added that required the developer to submit proposals on how to remove the asbestos. Members queried whether there would be any additional amenity space on the site and were informed that no additional space was proposed. The site was within an area where it was proposed more flats be built.

Jan Kool and Ragesh Khahria, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- The scheme failed to deliver appropriate new housing
- It would not be possible to ensure that only the flats remained single occupant
- The building cannot support the increased massing
- Will negatively impact upon the lives of residences in contradiction to their leases
- The construction will lead to residents having to experience large volumes of dirt, dust and debris
- The developer should look to improving the building before developing additional flats
- Unacceptable fire risks to residents
- The proposal would lead to bathrooms over bedrooms
- There was asbestos in the roof space

Councillor Vidhi Mohan, speaking in objection as Ward Member, raised the following points:

- The proposal would lead to overdevelopment of the property
- There would be a detrimental impact on quality of life of existing residents
- The quality of the habitable space being proposed was not appropriate
- Query whether the minimum space requirement was being met for every flat
- Some flats would only have skylights and no proper windows
- Asbestos was present in the building as outlined in a report from 2004
- The foundation of the building may not be able to take the additional load
- No lift would be provided
- A fire escape was not proposed
- Previous application had been refused.

The Head of Development Management stated that limited weight should be given to historic refusal due to a change in housing pressure. The site was located within the opportunity area and was felt to be an appropriate development, with amenities in the local area. The Committee were informed that Thanet Place was significantly overlooked by the current building and others in the area, and while additional windows were proposed it was felt the impact would be limited. The Head of Development Management informed the Committee that the presence of asbestos was not a planning consideration, as it fell under environmental health legislation, and fire escapes and loading fell under building control. Development would not be able to progress unless it was considered the building could take the additional load.

Some Members noted that the property was within the opportunity zone and the proposal would provide smaller units. The concerns in relation to asbestos and fire safety were felt to have been addressed as the development would need to meet regulations. It was noted that there would be logistics plan in place for a development which would look to mitigate the impact on residents.

Some Councillors raised concerns that the development would not improve or enhance the area, and there was a lack of amenity space. Further concerns were raised that some of the units would not meet the minimum size requirements and the proposal sought to add too many additional units in the space. The impact of the development on current residents of the block were also raised and it was felt that the residents should be consulted on the proposals.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Sue Winborn proposed and Councillor Luke Clancy seconded a motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of overdevelopment and the impact of amenity of existing residents, and the Committee voted 4 in favour, 5 against, so this motion thereby fell.

The Committee then voted on a second motion for **APPROVAL**, proposed by Councillor Humayun Kabir and seconded by Councillor Paul Scott, 5 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at Thanet House, Coombe Road.

A8/18 **17/05464/FUL 43 Downsway South Croydon CR2 0JB**

Demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of two storey building with accommodation in roof space and basement, containing 2x one bedroom, 2x two bedroom and 3x three bedroom flats with associated access, 5 parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse store.

Ward: Sanderstead

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members received confirmation that there was sufficient on street parking in the local area.

Dennis King, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- Detrimental to the amenities of surrounding properties and loss of light
- 8m high and close to neighbouring property
- 3m beyond back wall of neighbouring property – will impact on the sunlight of the neighbouring property
- Terrace will be overlooked
- Living conditions of adjoining occupier are seriously harmed

Jorge Nash, speaking on behalf of the applicant, raised the following points:

- 7 new dwellings would be created and would include family sized dwellings

- Design of the scheme had been chosen to replicate the appearance of a single dwelling house
- The massing was no greater than neighbouring property and was in keeping with the large detached dwellings of the surrounding area
- Impact of the scheme was largely on No.41, however the property would be set back from the street to reduce the impact
- Did not consider the concerns regarding overlooking to be any different from a two storey property
- Five off street parking spaces were to be provided
- The rear of the property would extend beyond the neighbouring property but was within with guidelines.

Councillor Lynne Hale, speaking in objection as Ward Member, raised the following points:

- Insufficient parking was to be provided
- Highway safety issues had not been addressed
- The design was out of character with the local area
- Impact on No.41 would be significant higher as the current property was a bungalow and had been designed to be lower to enable sunlight to shine into the property
- The scheme was illogical scheme and would put the neighbouring property into shade
- Sunlight was important to good mental health and it was unacceptable to reduce a residents natural light
- The scheme failed to reflect the significant changes in land levels and would create issues of overlooking

Officers confirmed that previous refused applications at the site were deeper than the current proposal, in addition planning policy had changed to reflect the need for more housing. The finished floor levels of the scheme would also be agreed to ensure the development was properly managed.

Some Members stated that the proposal was a large scale intensification of the site which would be detrimental to the local area, with significant impact upon No. 41 in particular with loss of sunlight. Members further noted that three units within the development would be below the minimum space requirement and concerns were raised in relation to flood risk. In response officers stated the scheme was compliant with flood risk assessments and the flood risk would not increase, furthermore a landscaping condition would be put in place to mitigate surface water drainage concerns.

Other Members of the Committee stated that the site could support intensification and while the development would be four storeys high it would appear to look like two storeys. It was felt that the proposal would have the appearance of a large detached house but would accommodate seven homes, and additional housing was required within the borough. It was stated that the largest impact would be upon the side windows of No.41, however as they were secondary windows it was felt that the property would continue to receive good levels of sunlight.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Jason Perry proposed and Councillor Luke Clancy seconded a motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of overdevelopment in relation to the size and massing, and the impact on amenities on neighbouring properties, and the Committee voted 4 in favour, 5 against, so this motion thereby fell.

Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Joy Prince seconded a second motion for the officer's recommendation, and the Committee voted 5 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 43 Downsway South Croydon CR2 0JB.

*The Committee adjourned from 8.44pm to 8.50pm.*

A9/18 **17/05264/FUL 32-34 Fairview Road, Norbury, SW16 5PT**

Demolition of existing garage and storage units on site, and the construction of a part two/part three/part four storey mixed use development consisting of 9 flats (1x one bedroom, 7x two bedroom and 1x three bedroom) and x1 commercial unit (B1(b), B1(c) and B2) with ancillary works to facilitate the proposal.

Ward: Norbury

*Councillor Shafi Khan recused himself of sitting on the Committee during the consideration of this item due to speaking in objection on behalf of residents.*

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members asked questions on whether access to the health centre would be impeded and were informed that at present there were a number of vehicles parked on the site, however the scheme would provide one parking space only and there would be a condition to restrict residents from applying for a parking permit. The scheme would return the footway and highway to public highway which should improve access to the health centre. A condition would also be put in place for a Construction Logistics Plan to be agreed to ensure the disruption to the doctor's surgery was kept to a minimum, and this would be enforced.

In response to Member questions officers confirmed that the buildings were not in a conservation area and were neither locally listed, or proposed to be listed. Officers stated that should the commercial unit be proposed to be of B2 usage then full details would be required to be submitted before operation began.

James Cross and Sean Creighton, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- There were 8,000 registered patients at the medical centre which required accessible access to the centre
- The road was narrow

- The developers had not consulted the surgery and there were concerns in regards to the impact and safety of patients
- A number vehicles needed access to the surgery and construction would limit this
- The development could bring into question the viability of the surgery
- Large development on a tight site which was badly designed
- The size of the proposed units was not appropriate and would not provide appropriate family housing
- The application should be deferred to enable consideration of the possible expansion of the surgery

Councillor Shafi Khan, on behalf of Councillor Maggie Mansell, speaking in objection as Ward Member, raised the following points:

- Previous permissions had been for three flats only
- Constrained site
- Concerns whether the units would be of sufficient size
- Appreciate the need for housing but inappropriate scheme
- Lack of amenity space
- Close to the railways line which would impact upon the lives of residents
- Impact of the construction on the patients of the neighbouring health centre and access to the site.
- Increased pressure on parking in the local area
- Concerns regarding the future viability of the medical centre

The Head of Development Management informed the Committee that prior approval had been given for three flats in one building and three in another, however the quality of the units could be far less under prior approval as there was less control of the application. Construction logistics would be carefully monitored to ensure that the medical practice maintained freedom of access, and the Head of Development Management assured the Committee that officers would speak with the applicant to ensure that they spoke to the surgery. He further stated that following construction there would likely be greater access to the medical centre as there would be greater control of the highway as there would no longer be parking from the garage.

The Members expressed concern that the medical centre had not been consulted, and while there was a need for housing it was important that developers worked with the local community. The construction logistics plan was noted as being an important aspect of the application to mitigate the impact on the medical centre.

Some Members stated that it was a shame that the buildings would be lost and suggested the matter should be reconsidered as it was overdevelopment and would seriously impact on the existing medical centre. It was further stated that the amenity of current and future occupiers would be negatively impacted.

Other Members noted that it was a constrained site, but there was a possibility that permission could be granted under prior approval for a lower quality development with conditions on restricting parking permits for future residents. While it was noted that the site was near a railway line, it was acknowledged that a number of homes were near railways and did not benefit from modern construction methods that minimised disruption.

Members stressed the importance of consultation with the medical centre, in particular in regards to the construction plan to ensure access was maintained throughout construction. Concerns were raised regarding the possible future use of the commercial unit and proposed that the B2 usage be removed.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Chris Wright proposed and Councillor Jason Perry seconded a motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of; overdevelopment in relation to the scale, size and massing, the quality of design, and the amenities of future occupiers and existing occupiers; and the Committee voted 4 in favour, 4 against. The Chair used their casting vote and voted against so this motion thereby fell.

The Committee then voted on a second motion proposed by Councillor Paul Scott and seconded by Councillor Humayun Kabir for the officer's recommendation with the proposed B2 category being removed from the description of development, for **APPROVAL**, and the Committee voted 4 in favour, 4 against. The Chair used their casting vote and voted in favour so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 32-34 Fairview Road, Norbury, SW16 5PT.

A10/18 **17/04330/FUL 360 Brighton Road, South Croydon, CR2 6AL**

Demolition of existing light industrial buildings; erection of 2 three storey building comprising 2 two bedroom and 2 one bedroom flats; 4 two storey two bedroom houses and 1 single storey two bedroom house; provision of associated parking.

Ward: Croham

Following the officers' presentation, Committee Members sought confirmation that the light industrial buildings proposed for demolition were in use and clarification as to the how the marketing of the buildings had taken place. Officers confirmed that the site was fully occupied and that it was a requirement for employment sites to be marketed for 18 months before consideration would be given to release the land for residential use. It was the officers view that the site was marketed at too high a value and details were not provided as to who had responded to the marketing. Officers further stated that if the site was over 500sqm then prior approval could not be applied.

Katherine Lloyd, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- The local community were strongly opposed to the scheme



- No consultation with residents had taken place
- Felt to be fundamentally detrimental to local community
- Churchill Road was at capacity for parking and there were road safety concerns. The scheme would increase the parking stress experienced in the area
- The access from Churchill Road was not wide enough and would not enable access for emergency vehicles
- The light industrial buildings were mainly one and two storey buildings and the proposed housing would be taller with windows overlooking neighbouring properties
- Would not be a pleasant area for the new residents
- Building design was out of character for local area
- Concerns regarding the marketing of the site

James Munroe spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following points:

- The scheme would be a valuable contribution to the community
- Would provide new housing in the area
- The business currently occupying the site was in the process of being wound down
- The site was being maintained to avoid issues such as squatting
- The only interest received during the marketing of the site was from commercial developers who sought to change the site to housing
- There would be a net benefit to residents as there would be fewer car movements associated with the site
- The proposed materials would connect the development to its previous industrial usage
- The scale and massing of the proposal was appropriate to the site
- The units would comply with size requirements
- Parking, fire safety and access had been assessed

Councillor Maria Gatland, speaking in objection as Ward Member, raised the following points:

- The site was a back land industrial site and would create a constrained development
- Housing was welcome, however there would be no family units or affordable housing provided
- Detrimental impact on the amenity of residents
- The design of the buildings were not in keeping with the character of the area
- Vehicle movements would increase which would exacerbate issues already experienced on Churchill Road
- The site was in a flood zone and objections had been received from the Environment Agency and the flood risk authority
- Concerns in regards to the marketing undertaken and the need for light industrial sites in the area to provide local employment
- Overdevelopment of the site

Members stated that it was important to maintain jobs in the local area and that the scheme was not in keeping with the local area. Concerns were further raised in regards to flood risk and highways safety.

Some Members stated that a future innovative scheme on the site could be appropriate but the size and massing of the current scheme was too great and there was not sufficient amenity space for potential residents.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Jason Perry proposed and Councillor Paul Scott seconded the officer's recommendation, and the Committee voted unanimously in favour, so planning permission was **REFUSED** for development at 360 Brighton Road, South Croydon, CR2 6AL.

A11/18 **17/04610/FUL Alice Lodge, 40 Brighton Road, Purley, CR8 2LG**

Proposed change of use from C2 residential care home to a house in multiple occupation for 18 occupants (sui generis).

Ward: Coulsdon West

This application was withdrawn from consideration by the Planning Committee for decision under delegated authority by officers.

A12/18 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

A13/18 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

The meeting ended at 10.10 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:**

.....  
.....