

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 7 June 2018

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.2- 17/04743/FUL (Land to rear of 26 Hilltop Road)

Three additional representations (from the same household) have been received, objecting to the proposal. As well as raising issues which have already been covered in the report, the following new comments were raised:

- Separation distance between the proposed dwellings and existing properties is incorrect in the officer report [OFFICER COMMENT: The separation distance given in the report is accurate, when scaling off the proposed plans.]
- Separation distances between the proposed development and existing properties do not comply with planning guidance used by other Councils e.g. Stroud District Council [OFFICER COMMENT: It is not known if this is correct however this is not relevant nor material to the decision. Planning decisions must be made in accordance with adopted planning policies and guidance and as set out in the report, the development accords fully with current adopted national, regional and local planning policy in Croydon]

Item 6.3 – 17/17/06318/FUL (Wandle Road Carpark)

1. The applicant has amended their affordable housing offer to ensure that it is in accordance with planning policy requirements for tenure splits so as to not require a “late stage review mechanism”.
2. As a result of the amendment, the tables included in the report in section 1 and at paragraph 9.11 are updated as follows:

Table, Section 1 (scheme summary):

	1B 2P	2B 4P	3B 4P	3B 5P	TOTAL	%
AFFORDABLE	8 (AR) 14 (SO)	7 (AR) 18 (SO)	3 (AR) 9 (SO)	1 (AR) 0 (SO)	19 41	15% 32%
PRIVATE	34	34	0	0	68	53%
TOTAL	56	59	12	1	128	
FAMILY UNITS	44%	46%	9%	1%		

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces
10 disabled bays	212

Table, para 9.11 (detailed affordable housing breakdown):

	Private	Affordable housing	TOTAL	Affordable Rent	Intermediate	TOTAL
Units	68	60	128	19	41	60
Unit %	53%	47%	100%	32%	68%	100%
Habitable Rooms	170	171	341	53	118	171
Habitable Rooms %	50%	50%	100%	31%	69%	100%

3. The change in the affordable housing does not affect the overall amount of affordable housing proposed. It increases the proportion of the affordable housing which would be affordable rent accommodation to make sure that it is 30%, by habitable room, which means that the policy requirement is met and there is therefore no need for a "late stage review mechanism". The RECOMMENDATION is therefore updated to remove the late stage review mechanism from paragraph 4.1 B b).
4. This change in affordable housing provision has slightly changed the size mix within the affordable rent provision, with an increase in larger units. This is considered to be acceptable.
5. The summary of the proposed non-residential floor areas at paragraph 5.1 contains a slight error; 815m² of flexible office and commercial space is proposed. This leads to no changed consideration.
6. The proposed service route is described as being "access from Wandle Road and egress to Church Road" in paragraphs 5.3 and 9.66 whereas the proposal is the other way round. Access to the disabled parking spaces would be in both directions. A condition is recommended to secure a delivery and servicing plan and car parking management plan which can ensure that this happens in an acceptable fashion.

Item 6.4 – 18/01019/FUL - 25 Monahan Avenue, Purley, CR8 3BB

Since the publication of the report two additional objections have been received. The following points are raised that are not already covered within the Committee Report:

- Concern around lack of detail submitted to allow a full assessment (OFFICER COMMENT: the material submitted gives enough information for officer to make a professional judgement and to put a recommendation before the Planning Committee)
- Seeking clarification of the height difference between existing and proposed (OFFICER COMMENT: the proposed apartment block would be approximately 1m higher than the existing house)
- Inaccuracies in the description of existing boundary treatment (OFFICER COMMENT: it is acknowledged that the boundary treatment is a combination of close board and open fencing, as well as hedges)

Paragraph 8.9 should be revised to state:

8.9 The neighbouring occupier at no. 23 would be separated from the proposal by approximately 6.5m and whilst the proposal would result in some overshadowing in the latter stages of the day, the shadow would be cast over side facing windows which are secondary in nature. In addition, the proposed planting/soft landscaping and privacy screens will help to avoid any overlooking and detrimental loss of privacy. This is a residential in character where some mutual overlooking is to be expected.

Item 6.5 - 18/01213/FUL (The Welcome Inn Public House)

1.

Correction to table:

Amount lost is 45sq.m commercial floorspace.

2.2 Conditions

Amendment to conditions as follows:

13) Restrict use of ground floor and basement to A4 Public house.

14) Commence within 3 years

Paragraph 4.5

Replace the word 'technics' with 'techniques'.

Paragraph 6.2

Insert the following:

Objection from Cllr Karen Jewitt, raising the following matters:

- Loss of amenity in the area.
- Overdevelopment of the site causing a detrimental effect on the public house and it the facilities it offers.
- Lack of affordable accommodation for the staff and the residents of the flats above.
- The London Plan will push local authorities "to recognise the heritage, economic, social and cultural value of pubs and ensure they are protected for local communities"

7.

Croydon Local plan 2018

Insert the following additional policy:

- DM21 Protecting public houses;

Paragraphs 8.2 and 8.7

Reference to policy 'DM22' should be policy 'DM21'.

Paragraph 8.6

The text of this paragraph should be revised to the following:

The applicant believes a lock up focussed pub will be more viable. The proposal includes a similar bar sales area to the existing, with the basement able to potentially provide a kitchen area (for the preparation of food) subject to a condition to provide details of ventilation equipment. An inspection of the site by officers confirms that the current building is in need of upgrading and that not all of the rear yard is in use. Although there would be a loss of commercial floor space of 45 sq.m, it is clear that the proposal would offer similar facilities and that the functionality of the bar would not be reduced. The proposal would offer, better layout, improved function and usability and would improve the condition of the building. Based on inspection and the information provided, officers considered that the loss of floor space would not jeopardise the viability of the public house. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in land use terms and is therefore supported. A condition restricting the use to a public house should secure the introduction of the use at ground floor level and would require a further reconsideration of the matter by the Council for proposals for the introduction of any alternative use.

Paragraph 8.20

The text of this paragraph should be revised to the following:

CLP Policy SP2.7 sets out a strategic target for 30% of all new homes to have three or more bedrooms. The proposed flats do not meet this strategic target as none would have three bedrooms. The proposed development would provide 4 one bedroom (1 person) flats. However, there is no requirement in policy for individual sites to provide a minimum level of 3 bedroom units, unless the application is for 10 or more units (as stated in policy SP2.7(b)). In this case, the application is for 5 residential units and therefore a minimum number of 3 bedroom units is not required.