

25 January 2018 Planning Committee Addendum

Planning committee

Item 5.1 Ref: 17/05999/PRE – Crystal Palace Football Club

1. Place Review Panel (PRP) comments

The scheme was presented to the PRP on 18/1/2018 for peer review. The formal PRP report has yet to be published, however Officers were presented and noted that the following key matters were raised by the Panel.

- In relation to the loss of housing the Panel emphasised the need for the planning application to include the delivery (either on or off site) of additional affordable housing to make up for that being lost.
- The Panel felt it would be fundamental to the success of scheme for there to be for a robust landscape and place strategy for the spaces around the stadium
- The Panel applauded the fact the Club were staying in Croydon and welcomed the desire to provide enhanced facilities.
- The Panel were happy with the scale and massing and accepted the rationale for the curved form.
- The Panel were however concerned that the main elevation would only be seen from the back of the car park or from the air, and as such there should be some consideration of creating a better place, perhaps considering an area where fans could congregate in front of the stadium. The Panel suggested that they replace the VIP parking with a place, a plaza, a space to enjoy the front on view, can be a flexible space for match-days.
- The Panel felt more could be done at the sides of the new Main Stand, this is because it is the western end of the stand that would be most visible from the Whitehorse Lane entrance and the eastern end when accessed from Holmesdale Road.
- Way finding elements need designing as public realm elements, to avoid clutter and be used far afield and close within the site.
- The Panel were concerned that glare arising from sun hitting the glazed elevation could become a problem and suggested that ways to prevent glare be introduced.
- The Panel did feel the iconography was overly complex, potentially too many competing elements. The glazed areas appeared flat and not of sufficient quality and rather than being iconic
- The Panel were concerned with the design at ground level doesn't (at present) relate to a human scale and is lacking detailed design development
- The Panel asked if a more comprehensive approach could be taken, integrating the Sainsbury's supermarket.
- The Panel advised that the application should include provision for community use of facilities on non-match days
- The Panel were concerned that no details have yet been provided about micro climate impacts

- The Panel felt that the application would have to be specific about the wider community benefits, improvements to high streets.
- The Panel also suggested that there should be consideration of redevelopment Wooderson Close in a more comprehensive way.
- The integration of the new and old stands needs greater development as it appears unresolved at both ends.

Item 6.1 - 17/05701/FUL – Shirley High School, Shirley Church Road, Croydon CR0 5EF

A further two letters of support and a letter of objection have been received in respect to the scheme. No new matters have been raised.

Item 6.2 - 17/05708/FUL – 1A West Hill, South Croydon CR2 0SB

Since the report has been draft a further three additional objections have been received on the above proposal. The majority of concerns and issues raised have been addressed in the committee report. However one of the objection letters raises specific concerns in respect to the committee report under the following headings:

- Irrelevant/unsound precedent [OFFICER COMMENT: The application is being assessed on its own merits, however the report is drawing attention to the surrounding character and planning history for a full and informed picture of the area]
- Intensification ['maximisation'] [OFFICER COMMENT: The draft London Plan does have an emphasis on intensification of suburbs to enable LPA to achieve challenging housing targets with small sites 1 to 25 units playing a much greater role in housing delivery. Members are aware that this is a draft.]
- Sustainable Transport [OFFICER COMMENT: Car parking and cycle parking are in line with the maximum parking standards]
- Hard and Soft landscape ['landscaping'] proposals [OFFICER COMMENT: The details submitted are indicative landscaping details and further details regarding species, quantity and positions of landscaping can be secured as part of a condition]
- Over use of Conditions – NPPF and 'the six tests' [OFFICER COMMENT: Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. The conditions proposed meet these tests]

Item 6.3 - 17/04836/FUL: Canterbury House, 2-6 Sydenham Road, Croydon, CR0 9XE

1. Consultation

1.1 **Update:** Two further consultation responses have been received since the Main Report was written and are summarised below:

1.2 **Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government** – Confirm they have received a copy of the Environmental Statement and have no comment to make on the Environmental Statement.

One Lansdowne Road, Croydon – A representation has been received from ‘One Lansdowne Road, Croydon’.

1.2.1 *‘Support the principle of the development as it will enhance the overall regeneration of Croydon’s town centre and, in particular, facilitate the creation of a new public pedestrian Plaza in the centre of the existing town block. However, it is essential if the new public space is to be enlivened that there are active A1 to A3 frontages onto the new Plaza’.*

2. **Officer Comment** – The matters raised have been addressed in the Main Committee Report, specifically at Paragraphs 9.2-9.13 and 9.69-9.86.

2.1 **Reasons for Refusal (Policy Refinement): Reason for Refusal 1 (Liveability)**

– **Add policies:** London Plan **3.6, 3.8, 7.7**; CLP1 **SP4.4**, CLP1.1 **SP4.4**; CUDP **UD8**; **Assessment justification:** The policy additions are consistent with the Officers assessment within the Main Report and do not introduce any new issues which have not already been assessed within the Officers report at Section 9 (paras 9.2-9.13, 9.92, 9.105-9.224) or alter the conclusions and recommendations in respect of liveability, amenity, unit size, quality of child playspace, high-quality/high-density and amenity impacts of tall buildings.

2.2 **Reason for Refusal 2 (Inclusive Access) – Delete:** Duplicate ‘London Plan’ reference; **Amend last sentence:** *‘The provision of blue badge spaces is deficient **if** assessed against **an inclusive design** compliant **scheme** and would be contrary to London Plan policy 6.13 on parking and the Mayors Housing SPG’*; **Add policies:** London Plan **3.5, 3.8, 6.13**, CLP2 **DM31**; CUDP **UD7**; **Assessment justification:** The policy additions are consistent with the Officers assessment within the Main Report and do not introduce any new issues which have not already been assessed within the Officers report at Section 9 (paras 9.159-9.167 and 9.237-9.242) or alter the conclusions and recommendations in respect of inclusive access and blue badge parking.

2.3 **Reason for Refusal 3 (Design) – Add policies:** London Plan **7.1, 7.4**; CLP1.1 **SP4.1, SP4.2, SP4.4**; CLP2 **DM14, DM40**; CUDP **UD2, UD3, UD15**;

Assessment justification: The policy additions are consistent with the Officers assessment within the Main Report and do not introduce any new issues which have not already been assessed within the Officers report at Section 9 (paras 9.11-9.13 and 9.61-9.104) or alter the conclusions and recommendations in respect of local character, legibility, refuse, urban design including high quality/high density design and the impact of the scheme on the Croydon Opportunity Area.

2.4 Reason for Refusal 4 (Mix) – Amend first sentence to add: *‘The proposal fails to provide an appropriate mix of new homes, including affordable housing of a mix, type and tenure; **The proposal** is assessed as being inconsistent with the adopted and draft policy position on housing needs’.*

Assessment justification: The amendment adds clarity to the reason and is not considered to alter the meaning or substance of the reason for refusal and remains consistent with the Officers assessment and conclusions within the Main Report.

3. Correction – Section 8.9 of the report. Correction: DM36 DM40 Croydon Opportunity Area. **Clarification** – In respect of the status of the Place Review Panel report although the Place Review Panel report is annotated as confidential this report is publicly available given the application is a planning application. Place Review Panel reports are only confidential if schemes are in pre-application.

4. Human Rights & Equalities Implications: As Members will be aware, Members should take account of the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Officers have taken into account the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. The Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics and places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken these matters into account in the assessment of the application. Officers have highlighted inadequacies in respect of submitted application.

5. Recommendation: The recommendation as set out at Section 3 of the Main Officers Report, subject to the minor refinements set out above, remains unchanged.