

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 22 March 2018

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 – 17/06297/FUL (Lion Green Road)

1. A further four representations have been received since the report has been published. These were 3 in objection and 1 in support. They raised no issues not already covered within the report.
2. A further representation has been received from Chipstead Valley Residents Association raising concerns on the adequacy of the Junction Impact Assessments and that the relocated car park access closer to the junction has not been fully assessed, suggesting that no decision should be made until further modelling has been undertaken. These issues have been dealt with in the report.
3. Paragraph 5.10 of the report states that Surrey County Council (SCC) have made no comment on the scheme. An objection has been made by SCC on the assessment of the impact on the Lion Green Road/Chipstead Valley Road/Woodcote Grove junction, and any potential impacts on SCCs highway network, given the location of the site. Since the objection has been received a further Junction Impact Assessment has been produced by the applicants. This has been sent through to SCC for further comment, although it is unlikely that these comments will be received prior to the Committee meeting. Therefore their position must be reported as an objection. These issues have been dealt with in the report.
4. An additional requirement of the legal agreement must be added to paragraph 4.1 B, which should read as follows:

m) Cycle and pedestrian improvements as necessary

5. An additional paragraph should be include as 4.6, which should read as follows:

That, if by 22 June the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Planning is delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

6. Coulsdon West Residents Association (CWRA) were not identified in the report. As such paragraph 7.2 should read as follows:

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- *Chipstead Residents Association (Objecting)*
- *Hooley Residents Associations (Objecting)*
- *Old Coulsdon Residents Association (Objecting)*
- *East Coulsdon Residents Association (Supporting)*
- *Hartley & District Residents Association (Supporting)*
- *Coulsdon West Residents Association (Supporting)*

7. The first sentence of Paragraph 8.11 should be changed to:

In terms of affordable housing, the scheme proposes 50% affordable housing (by habitable room) at a ratio of 44-56 affordable rent and shared ownership (in favour of shared ownership)

8. Paragraph 8.27 should be revised to read as follows:

The proposed scale, height and massing is on balance supported. These aspects need to be balanced against the impacts on the SAM as well as the way that the built form coalesces and potentially blocks views and appreciation of the SAM (when viewed from Lion Green Road). The arrangement of the blocks and cut out sections have been positioned to provide glimpses towards the SAM.

Item 6.2 – 17/06218/OUT (Proposed Community Use)

1. A further objection letter has been received but raised no issues not already covered within the report.
2. Condition 1c requiring a car club space at the community centre is not considered necessary and should be removed from the legal agreement.
3. Condition 1f requiring retention of scheme architect is not considered necessary and should be removed from the legal agreement.
4. During periods when the use of the CCC is at its slowest (i.e. during the day) and the potential NHS facility is likely to be used, it is considered there should be a degree of flexibility between the new CCC site and potential NHS site in terms of car parking. Whilst it is understood from the applicant that the CCC are not keen with this arrangement, it must be explored and therefore an additional condition is recommended, as follows:

Condition 29) Car Parking Design and Management Plan (CPDMP)

5. Paragraph 7.11 should be revised to read as follows:

A high-quality appearance is clearly achievable and expected through the reserved matters stage. Furthermore, conditions covering architectural detailing, materials and public realm will ensure the final scheme delivers an exemplar design and architectural expression.

6. The second sentence in paragraph 7.34 should read as follows:

The proposal will need to supply 1 short stay space per 3 staff and 1 long stay space per 8 staff, as well as 1 space per 100sqm GFA.

Item 6.3 – 17/06217/FUL (Former CALAT site, Malcolm Road)

1. Two further letters of support have been received but raised no issues not already covered within the report.

2. Coulsdon West Residents Association (CWRA) were not identified in the report. As such paragraph 7.2 should read as follows:

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- *Old Coulsdon Residents Association [objecting]*
- *Chipstead Residents Association [objecting]*
- *Hooley Residents Association [objecting]*
- *Coulsdon Community Centre [supporting]*
- *East Coulsdon Residents Association [supporting]*
- *Hartley & District Residents Association [supporting]*
- *Coulsdon West Residents Association (supporting)*

Item 6.4 – 17/06216/FUL (CCC at Barrie Close)

1. Paragraph 3.6 should read:

The development proposes a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes. 64% of units would be suitable sized as family occupation.

2. Paragraph 8.57 should read:

... (and a scheme that provides 48% affordable housing and a 64% mix of family units) the loss of the trees on balance, can be justified in this instance.

3. Condition 25 for a sustainable travel strategy is a duplication of the 1c requirement of the Section 106 agreement and should be removed as a condition.

Item 6.6 – 17/06360/FUL (Garages and Forecourt North Of Avenue Road)

Amended Plans

Amended plans were received from the applicant on 22nd March 2018. These amended plans propose:

- To remove the proposed parapet wall around the building, reducing the height of the development by 1.1 metres on all elevations.
- To provide an additional one car parking place on site. This is considered an acceptable amendment which does not alter the aims of the project to reduce the potential impact of parking and transport issues on the wider area.

The relevant drawings for the case are therefore amended to the below:

LBC/0003/E/GA/0001, LBC/0003/E/GA/0002, LBC/0003/E/GA/0003,
LBC/0003/E/GA/0151, LBC/0003/E/GA/0001B, LBC/0003/E/GA/0005B,
LBC/0003/E/GA/0006, LBC/0003/E/GA/0007, LBC/0003/E/GA/0008A,
LBC/0003/E/GA/0151B, LBC/0003/E/GA/0152A, LBC/0003/E/GA/0160B,
LBC/0003/E/GA/0161A, LBC/0003/E/GA/0165A, LBC/0003/E/GA/6001,
LBC/0003/E/GA/7001, LBC-0003-P-GA-0010,

Since the publication of the Officer's report, two additional neighbour representations have been received. The additional planning considerations have been raised and responded to below:

Density

- *The proposed development is contrary to the London Plan Density Matrix.*
As detailed within the case officer's report, the density matrix is "a rigorous appreciation of housing density is crucial to realising the optimum potential of sites, but it is only the start of planning housing development, not the end. It is not appropriate to apply Table 3.2 mechanistically".
- *The proposed development is contrary to Policy 3.29 of the London Plan in not providing any family units within a low density, low PTAL setting.*
The above is a point associated to table 3.2, the London Plan Density Matrix. Whilst no family units are provided, as set out in the report, and the site is located in a low PTAL area, it is in close proximity to a PTAL 4 area, a number of transport modes as well as other amenities and therefore should be considered in this context.

Design

- *The proposed garage block was built as part of 4-4d Avenue Road and therefore the construction of a development within the grounds of these existing building should be subservient to the main building and therefore not adhering to DM10.1.*
The existing garages are not located within grounds of 4-4d Avenue Road and therefore, this element of DM10.1 is not a consideration for this application.

Unit Mix

- *The proposal does not provide the minimum percentage of 3 bedroom homes. The Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SMHA) has no weight if compared to the adopted plan policy.*
The SMHA is the detailed evidence which supports the policy. It provides clarity on the needs of the borough in relation to unit mixes and unit types and is therefore an important consideration alongside the CLP 2018.

Impact upon adjoining occupiers

- *All the proposed habitable rooms and balconies would overlook 4-4d Avenue Road being contrary to DM10.6.*
Policy DM10.6c states that proposals should ensure they do not result in direct overlooking of private outdoor space (except communal open space) within 10m perpendicular to the rear elevation of the dwelling. The proposed development is separated from the rear elevation by a minimum of 19m and therefore would comply with this policy.

Daylight and Sunlight

- To clarify point 7.20 from the officers report in regards to the loss of daylight to 60/60A Warminster Road:
- The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) refers to the amount of light entering a room. This should be greater than 27% or more than 0.8 times its former value (before the new development). Once the loss is greater than these amounts, the impact would be noticeable in the affected room.

- Within the ground floor windows of 60/60A Warminster Road these would continue to have at a minimum 23.34% of VSC. The overall loss is at greatest 27.1%. Taking into account that the proposal has now been reduced in scale which are likely to increase the VSC levels received in these rooms, as well as these dwellings continuing to receive an acceptable amount of visible sky received (NSL) and annual probably sunlight hours (APSH) in relation to the BRE guidance, these are not considered to be so significant an impact so as to refuse planning permission.

Playspace

- *The development provided no play space and is contrary to DM10.4.* Policy DM10.4d states that all development and developments of 10 or more houses must provide a minimum of 10m² per child of new play space, calculated using the Mayors London population yield calculator. This equates to 9.8 m² overall.

This can be integrated into the landscaping on site and is secured condition.

This page is intentionally left blank