

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 21 June 2018

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.2- 18/00588/FUL (4 Rectory Park)

Two further additional representations have been received, objecting to the proposal. As well as raising issues which have already been covered in the report, the following additional comment was raised:

- Impact of car lights on the neighbouring property [OFFICER COMMENT: This was highlighted in the previous approval and conditions have been attached to mitigate impacts]
- Impact on character [OFFICER COMMENT: This has been addressed in the report and formed part of the previous scheme which was found acceptable. The plans can be scaled from and have the levels shown to allow for assessment]
- Living conditions for future occupiers [OFFICER COMMENT: This has also been addressed in the previous report and this scheme was found acceptable. The plans can be scaled from and the GIA calculated from there]
- Access & Parking [OFFICER COMMENT: This has been addressed in the report and was part of the previous scheme which was found acceptable]
- Cycle storage [OFFICER COMMENT: This has been addressed in the report and a condition has been attached requesting further details of the cycle storage to be approved.]
- Trees [OFFICER COMMENT: This has been addressed in the report and a condition has been attached to secure the protection of the street tree which will need to be approved similar to the previously approved scheme]
- Landscaping [OFFICER COMMENT: This has been addressed in the report and a condition has been attached to secure the street tree which need to be approved]
- Flooding [OFFICER COMMENT: The site is not located within a flooding area however a condition has been attached to ensure that a SUDs scheme is incorporated in the scheme]

The diagram included in the report showing the changes to between the proposal and the previous approval is incorrect and has been reassessed by the applicant and should be indicated as follows:



As such Paragraph 8.4 of the report also needs to be updated to read as follows:

“The main differences between the approved scheme and the current scheme are minor increases in the overall depth of the building footprint with a marginal increase in the depth of the bays providing an increase in the depth of the property by 0.8m to 16.7m. Overall given the scale of the development these differences are minor in the streetscape.”

Item 6.3 – 18/00831/FUL 122 Church Road (Queens Hotel)

At the time of finalising this addendum, a further 517 letters of support (the vast majority being pro-forma letters) have been received advised to be from businesses and residents – raising similar issues as highlighted in the report.

A further 40 pro-forma letters of objection have been received – advised to be submitted by local businesses – raising similar issues as highlighted in the report.

Following a further review of consultation responses – it was noted that the Norwood Society referred the planning application to Planning Committee. A summary of their objections to the scheme are as follows:

- The scheme does not go far enough to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and would still represent an over-development of the site, detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area;

- The extension to the south west does something to mitigate the lopsided effect of the original buildings but the extension would be too high (with an unsightly top floor). The recladding of the northern wing is welcome but would not restore the original harmony;
- The height, bulk, mass and scale of the proposed new buildings would detract from the character of the conservation area
- The reduction in heights and the retention of the mews building would not be sufficient to overcome the injurious effects of the extensions – with overlooking and noise nuisance
- The increase in car and coach parking is welcome but concerns over traffic issues remain (noise from vehicles exiting the underground car park)
- It is unclear how the hotelier will manage coaches – with the possibility of some being parked in neighbouring streets
- Limited night-time car parking in the area
- The introduction of a Control parking Zone is not the answer – with local residents having to pay to park outside their properties
- Coach manoeuvring on site will be difficult – especially at times when traffic backs up.
- The walking times from neighbouring stations is over-played – especially when taking account of hills

Consideration of all these points is contained within the Committee Report.

Additional drawings for approval to be added (which outline the extent of demolition proposed as part of the planning application. This is supplemental to the proposed plans – which determine the extent of development and scale of demolition. These drawings are listed as follows:

A 2702-500-R4; A2702-501-R4; A2702-502-R4; A 2702-503-R4; A 2702-504-R4; A2702-505-R4; A 2702-506-R4; A 2702-507-R4; A 2702-508-R4

Additional information has been received from the applicant as regards the availability of overnight coach parking. Further sites are available for overnight parking (on top of the previously identified Elm Park Nursery). These sites are Canadian Avenue Lorry Park in Catford (managed by LB Lewisham) and St Georges Road Beckenham (managed by LB Bromley).

Additional planning condition – Guest Transfer Management Plan – incorporating mini bus pick up from transport nodes to be agreed by the local planning authority and implemented in accordance with Management Plan.

Item 6.4 - 18/01263/FUL (St James Hall, Little Roke Avenue)

The Council has recently received an appeal against the non – determination of this planning application – which precludes the local planning authority from taking a decision to grant or refuse planning permission. On this basis and in view of the officer's recommendation to GRANT planning permission, the revised OFFICER RECOMMENDATION should read as follows:

That the Planning Committee resolves NOT TO CONTEST THE FORTHCOMING APPEAL, subject to PINS and the appellant agreeing the imposition of the following conditions and any further conditions as considered necessary by those engaged in the appeal process..

Two 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:

- Lack of consultation [OFFICER COMMENT: The scheme advertised by direct neighbour notification letter as per the statutory requirements]