

19th April 2018 Planning Committee Addendum

Planning Committee

Item 6.1 – Ref: 16/03825/P - 21-27 Sheldon Street, Croydon, CR0 1SS

Paragraph 7.16 incorrectly referenced the adjoining property as No.15 Sheldon Street it should be No.19 Sheldon Street, the paragraph should read:

The proposed building is of a greater height and footprint to the existing building on site. It is considered that the inclusion of a break between the boundary of the site with No.19 Sheldon Street and the proposed built form helps to mitigate its impact.

Furthermore the projection of built form beyond the rear elevation of No.19 is within acceptable levels, it is accepted that the proposal will result in some overshadowing of the rear elevation and amenity space of No.19 given the site's orientation, however, it is considered on balance that given the presence of an existing three storey building on the application site the impact wouldn't significantly differentiate from the existing impact.

Item 6.2 – Refs: 17/04438/FUL - 119 Purley Oaks Road, South Croydon CR2 0NY

Paragraph 1.0 the description of the development needs to be amended to read as follows:

“Demolition of existing buildings, erection of 2 pairs of two storey four bedroom semi-detached houses with accommodation in the roof, erection of a pair of semi-detached part two part three storey four bedroom houses at the rear; formation of vehicular access, provision of parking and landscaping.”

We have also received a later letter from one of the objectors raising site ownership and access issues – and challenging the right of the applicant to access the development via Wetheren Close. (OFFICER COMMENT) The issues raised relate to private land law matters and do not constitute material planning considerations.

Item 6.3 – Refs: 17/05046/FUL - Land Adjacent to East Croydon Station and Land at Cherry Orchard Road, Cherry Orchard Gardens, Billington Hill, Croydon

The affordable housing offer has been revised. The offer still represents 24% affordable housing, but the ratio between affordable rent and shared ownership has altered. 14 habitable rooms have changed from Shared Ownership to Affordable Rent. The provision is now 60 habitable rooms of affordable rent units and 213 habitable rooms of shared ownership units (22%:78% split). You will note that the current offer now matches the affordable rent provision when compared with the 2013 consent and still retains a significant increase in terms of shared ownership.

The changes to the affordable housing mix mean that a larger amount of play space is required, however, the development still exceeds this requirement.

Drawing numbered PA2004 is to be omitted from the drawing list.

Reference is made to 'Early' and 'Late' stage review mechanisms. For clarity the 'Early' review mechanisms include one that is triggered where an agreed level of progress on implementing the permission has not been reached after two years of the permission and an updated early

stage review (known as a stop/start review), in the event a scheme stalls following an early stage review.

Paragraph 2.1 B n) should refer to retention of scheme architects or such other alternative architects of the same calibre.

Item 6.3 – Refs: 17/05035/FUL Eastern End of Existing Pedestrian Footbridge at East Croydon Station, Croydon

A further representation has been received urging the footbridge connection to be completed.

Item 6.4 – Ref: 18/00547/FUL - Selhurst Park Stadium (Whitehorse Lane), And Sainsbury's Car Park (120-122 Whitehorse Lane), No's 22, 24, 26, 28, 30 & 32 Wooderson Close, South Norwood, London, SE25 6PU

Since the publication of the report the following additional consultee responses have been received:

London Borough of Lambeth:

In summary the London Borough of Lambeth have confirmed that they have no objection to the application. Any increase in car parking demand is likely to further exacerbate parking stress. As such Lambeth advise the applicant to ensure that there are appropriate measures in place to reduce the impact of the projected increase in car travel demand.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)

Follow submission by the Applicant of additional drainage related information, the LLFA remove their objection subject to a condition relating to runoff rates.

Planning officer comment: An additional condition should be imposed on any consent to ensure the requisite drainage standards are achieved.

Football Association: Offer support for the Application

Met Police CTSA:

Raises no objection subject to conditions and planning obligations to secure better management and control of the Sainsbury's car park on match days, in particular to separate pedestrians from vehicles.

Additionally, require hard landscaping to accord with ratings set out in WSP CPFC HVM 002 and funding the implementation of the landscape measures. Require that the detailed proposals be agreed by the Metropolitan Police.

Sainsbury's: Raise no objection in principle, but highlight the following concerns:

- There is a lack of analysis to justify car parking reductions and alterations to car parking managements.

Planning officer comment: This is dealt with at section 8.20 to 8.22 of the committee report. The council has reviewed CCTV images that show the vacant car parking levels in the Sainsbury's Car Park. The CCTV images were taken every hour on a weekday afternoon/evening between 4:30pm and 22:30pm, and a Saturday between 7am and 6pm. The proposal would result in the loss of 22 car parking spaces from Sainsbury's Car Park, and it has been observed that many more than 22 spaces were vacant at peak times.

Changes in population or car ownership are not foreseen to significant shift such that it would generate an increase in car parking space demand for the retail store. Neither TfL or the Council's Highway Officer have raised any objection to the loss of car parking.

As part of planning permission 77/20/997 dated 19/12/1977 there are a number of conditions imposed to prevent the store being open to public 3 hours before and after a match. It is considered that matchday operational changes, including the car park management plan, resulting from the development would not significantly impact the operation of Sainsbury's store. The car park management plan is recommended to be secured via condition. It is reasonable to assume that the Club will consult with Sainsbury's in the preparation of the management plan.

A condition is recommended to prevent excessive number of football games being played at the stadium, which provides a greater level of control than currently is the case.

- Construction activities will disrupt the operation of the store.

Planning officer comment: Conditions are recommended to ensure that the impact of the development during construction is appropriately mitigated to prevent the development having unacceptable impact on adjoining businesses and residential properties, within the limitations of planning legislation. The impact of the proposed loss of parking on Sainsbury's store is considered above.

- That the application fails to create a safe and secure environment for our colleagues and customers.

Planning officer comment: The proposals have been considered by the Metropolitan Police who are satisfied that (subject to conditions and planning obligations, for example to secure the installation of appropriate barriers/gates and CCTV) the proposals would design out crime and deter terrorism, assist in the detection of terrorist activity and help defer its effects. These measures are wide ranging and would not only benefit supporters attending the game, but would also indirectly highly likely to improve the safety of customers and staff members of Sainsbury's. Officers are satisfied that the development would not have an adverse impact on the safety and security of Sainsbury's staff or customers.

- That Sainsbury's have not been sufficiently engaged on the application.

Planning officer comment: Officers' are satisfied that the consultation is in accordance with statutory requirements and has been wide ranging and robust.

In addition a further 16 Objections have been received from nearby occupiers which largely echo concerns previously raised.

Planning officer comment: There was one matter that has been raised which has not already been addressed in the report if the need for a planning obligation to pay for improvements at Norwood Junction Station (for example to provide step free access to the platforms via lifts etc). Planning legislation (regulation 122 of the Local Government Act) states that in order to

secure a planning obligations, the need for the mitigation measure must be directly related to the development.

Network Rail have advised that there is no causal relationship between the expansion of the Main Stand and the need for enhancements at Norwood Junction. Network Rail advise the works are needed as a result of the Brighton Mainline upgrade project and are not directly related to the impact of the proposed development.

There is also concern that the nature of work required at Norwood Junction could vary significantly depending on whether the Croydon Area Remodelling Scheme (which is a main element of the Brighton Mainline Upgrade Programme). The concern being that an independent study has identified that undertaking works at Norwood Junction prior to the Upgrade Programme may ultimately end up being abortive. The Applicant has advised that wish to maintain a continuing dialogue with Network Rail (and train operating companies) in respect of the broader Upgrade Programme and the timing of initiatives that may form part of it. A planning obligation is to be secured which will require the Development of Station Management plans with local transport operators including for Norwood Junction, and this will include funding for to investigate options and funding the implementation of measures at Norwood Junction station.

In addition to submission raising objection to the scheme, a further 61 submissions were made since the report was published in support of the application.

Amend Head of Term 14 (hard landscaping proposals) to refer to the need for products to meet the requisite rating and to be approved by the CTSA and Council and cost of implementation met by the Applicant (including vehicle security barriers and traffic control measures). There is also a need to fund a review of the existing matchday TMO and cover the cost of any associated changes to the TMO.

Amend Head of Term 4.10 (car parking management) to require the car parking management plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council in consultation with TfL and Metropolitan police.

Add WSP CPFC HVM 002 to list of approved plans/documents.