

PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.1

1 APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 16/00212/P
Location: Jubilee Bridge Car Park, Lower Church Street, Croydon, CR0 1XF
Ward: Waddon
Description: Use of 8 parking spaces as community wood recycling enterprise
Drawing Nos: location plan, GA Plan - as existing, Internal elevation A - as existing,
GA Plan - as proposed, Internal elevation A - as proposed
Applicant: London Borough of Croydon
Agent: N/A
Case Officer: Sean Scott

- 1.1 This application is being reported to committee because objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The proposed change of use is acceptable in principle.
- 2.2 The development would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.
- 2.3 There would be no detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers when compared to the existing use.
- 2.4 Highways and traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site would not be adversely affected by the development.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission.
- 3.2 That the Director of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

- 1) Development in accordance with approved plans.
- 2) External facing materials to be submitted and approved.
- 3) Time limit – temporary period for three years
- 4) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

Informatives

- 1) Site notice removal
- 2) Advisory regarding the height restriction for entering the car park and the height of the underside of the bridge.
- 3) Any [other] informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 The use of 8 car parking spaces as a community wood recycling enterprise for a temporary period of three years.
- 4.2 The application entails the installation of palisade fencing, a shipping container and a roller shutter.

Site and Surroundings

- 4.3 The site is occupied by a car park located underneath Jubilee Bridge in Waddon ward. This area is dominated by transport links intersecting in this area; however, residential units are predominant in the wider area. The application site is located within an Area of High Density, and an Archaeological Priority Zone as designated by the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013).

Planning History

- 4.4 None.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.
- 5.2 No statutory or non-statutory consultees have commented on the application

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 The application has been publicised by way of three site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 1 Objecting: 1 Supporting: 0

No of petitions received: 0 objecting containing 0 signatories
 0 supporting containing 0 signatories

- 6.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

Objections

- Why remove 8 parking spaces from a car park that at weekends is fully congested, when there is an area local that can be used for this purpose, i.e. clear space on the north corner of Church Road at Reeves Corner

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

1. The principle of development
2. The impact on the visual amenity of the area
3. The impact on adjoining occupiers
4. Highways & parking considerations

The principle of development

- 7.2 The subject property is in use as a car park which falls within a sui generis use, its conversion to a wood recycling facility would fall within a B2 use. The current use is not protected and it is considered that the proposed change of use would be acceptable provided that it meets the following principle issues and their requirements.

The impact on the visual amenity of the area

- 7.3 The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 17 is of relevance. The London Plan 2011 Policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 state that development should make a positive contribution to the local character, public realm and streetscape. It should incorporate the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context.
- 7.4 CLPSP SP1.1 states that the Council will require all new development to contribute to enhancing a sense of place and improving the character of the area. SP4.1 and SP4.2 require development to be of a high quality which respects and enhances local character. Policies SP4.7, SP4.8 and SP4.9 encourage improvements to the public realm.
- 7.5 Croydon Plan 2006 (Saved Policies 2013) UD2 and UD3 require consideration to be given to the relationship of the development to adjoining properties, and its impact of the streetscene in general.
- 7.6 The proposed development would be located underneath the bridge and would only be visible in the immediate locality. The area underneath the bridge covered by the application would be fully enclosed by the proposed boundary treatment.
- 7.7 In addition, the proposed development would be for a temporary period of three years, after which time, the development would be removed.
- 7.8 The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of the area.

The impact on adjoining occupiers

- 7.9 The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011) Policy 7.6 *Architecture* states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Policy UD2 and UD8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013 seek to protect residential amenity to prevent adjoining and nearby occupiers from loss of privacy, loss of light, loss of outlook and adverse visual intrusion. In addition Policy EP1 of the Croydon Plan 2006) Saved Policies 2013 - *Control of Potentially Polluting Uses* is of importance.
- 7.10 A shipping container, palisade fencing and roller shutters would section off a triangular parcel of land in the south eastern corner of the car park. This area is

where the height of the bridge is lower and this allows for the boundary treatment to extend to the full height. This would aid safety and security at the site.

- 7.11 The proposed development would not be immediately adjacent to any residential uses, there would be a degree of separation. Given that the site's existing use is as a car park that would experience numerous comings and goings, it is considered that activity associated with the proposed use would be no worse than the existing situation and therefore is considered acceptable.

Highways & parking considerations

- 7.12 The London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011) Policy 6.3 is relevant and states that development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network and Policies 6.9 *cycling* and 6.13 *Parking* should also be considered. The Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan 2006) Policy T2 *Traffic Generation from Development* states that development will only be granted where the traffic generated by a development can be satisfactorily accommodated on nearby roads, allowing for ameliorating measures such as the increased use of public transport or cycling. The Croydon Plan Policy T8 *Parking Standards* sets out parking standards for residential development. In addition SPD2 sets out design guidance for forecourt parking and Policy UD13 states that car parking must not be allowed to dominate or determine the urban form and should be safe, secure, efficient and well designed.
- 7.13 The access to the car park is off Booth Road and the area to be utilised for the proposed development is adjacent to this entrance. There should therefore be minimal conflict between vehicles delivering to the site and other users of the car park.
- 7.14 A new pedestrian access to the recycling centre is proposed within the flank wall to the pedestrian subway and will therefore negate the need for visitors on foot to have to walk through the car park to access the facility. It is therefore considered that potential conflict between visitors to the facility and users of the car park will be minimised and therefore will not create an unsafe environment within the car park.
- 7.15 The Council's Transport Officer has not raised any objection to the loss of 8 car parking spaces and it is noted that there are alternative car parks within the town centre a short distance from the site. In addition, the temporary nature of the proposed development, would mean that the site would be returned to the car parking use when the proposed use is finished. It is not a permanent loss of the car parking spaces.
- 7.16 The only issue to be considered is the fact that the car park entrance has a height restriction of 2 metres and the headroom to the flyover is also limited. This may have implications for delivery vehicles to the facility and installation of the container that will be used as the office building. It is therefore suggested that an informative is added to the planning permission making the applicant aware of this.

Other Planning Issues

- 7.17 The objector to the scheme has questioned why this site has been used (which is busy as a car park on Saturdays), when there is a vacant site at Reeves Corner. However, the application relates to this site and the Local Planning Authority has to

determine the proposals before them. We have not received an application for this development on Reeves Corner.

7.18 The application would not have any archaeological implications as the proposed development would not 'break ground'.

Conclusions

7.19 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.