

# Agenda Item 5

PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Thursday 5th September 2024

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA –

## Item 5.1 23/02960/FUL - 18 Norbury Close, Norbury, SW16 3ND

- Paragraphs 3.2 and 8.23 of the officer's report state that the property benefits from an existing detached garage - this is not the case; the only parking is on the front driveway.
- The table in paragraph 8.11 of the officer's report states that the GIA of the first floor 2b3p flat is 59.94sqm, which is marginally below the minimum GIA of 61sqm. This figure is incorrect and the floorspace is 45 square metres. Whilst this is smaller than the minimum GIA required, the layout proposed (with the exception of the lobby area) is virtually identical to that approved under reference 19/04480/FUL. Officers consider that as there is only a minor change to the layout already approved, on balance, it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission on this basis.
- 1 additional condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the plans.

## Item 5.2 24/00258/FUL – 8 Cedar Walk, Kenley, CR8 5JL

- 1 additional representation was received from a local resident objecting to the proposed development. No new planning issues have been raised.
- The officer's report incorrectly states that T1 Wellingtonia is located within the boundaries of 7 Cedar Walk. This protected tree is located within the garden of 8 Cedar Walk.

## Item 5.3 24/00915/FUL – R/O 31-33 HILLCREST ROAD, WHYTELEAFE, CR3 0DN

- A site section drawing has been submitted (drawing number: 23-275-P019). This however does not change the nature of the development consulted on and therefore it is considered neighbours would not be prejudiced by not being consulted on this drawing. This drawing should be added to the list of drawing numbers.

## Item 5.4 22/03139/FUL - Crossways Dental Practice, 328 Coulsdon Road, Coulsdon CR5 1EB

An additional representation has been received from a neighbour disputing the figures stated in paragraph 8.7 of the officer's report with regards to retained garden areas.


Policy DM 10.4(e) states *'In the case of development in the grounds of an existing building which is retained, a minimum length of 10m and no less than half or 200m<sup>2</sup> (whichever is the smaller) of the existing garden area is retained for the host property, after the subdivision of the garden'*.

The representation states:

'The total area of the application site excluding the garage, and the hardstanding is 176.5m<sup>2</sup>. The hardstanding is just wider than the garage (see image 3) and runs from the street pavement to the garage itself. The area for the hardstanding and the garage is 33.2m<sup>2</sup>, which leaves 143.3m<sup>2</sup> remaining. I have not included the area identified as 2 x Staff parking spaces (shown larger on the drawing) as this has not been mentioned in the report, only the hardstanding. The 240m<sup>2</sup> is based on the area including the area identified as staff car parking, but not the area abutting the dental surgery.


I would contend that the hardstanding abutting to the dental surgery should also be taken into consideration in the calculation. If accepted, then the space would be reduced to 87.3m<sup>2</sup>. If not, and the area remains as per the report as being 122m<sup>2</sup>, it is still below the 50% threshold and therefore not in accordance with policy DM10.4e.'

The following graphic is provided. Photos of the hardstanding are also provided but these have also been emailed to Members of the Committee so are not copied into this addendum:



**Officer's response:**

The garden division has been calculated as follows:



- Existing: 244.17sqm (not including the parking area as this is not amenity space).
- Proposed: 122.81sqm = half of the existing garden area retained (policy compliant).
- The hardstanding and shed directly behind the host building form part of the existing garden area so has not been removed from the calculation.

This page is intentionally left blank