

Item 6.1: 18/02613/ FUL – 95-95a Foxley Lane, Purley, CR8 3HP

- Replace the following sentence within paragraph 7.14 from;

with a separation distance of 3.17 metres, stepping out to 5.7 and 28.3 metres..
to

with a separation distance of 3.17 metres, stepping out to 5.7 and 23.8 metres..

Item 6.2: 18/00611/FUL - The Former Queens Arms, 40 Portland Road and 5-7 Doyle Road, South Norwood, London, SE25 4PQ

- One additional representation was received reaffirming support for development. The representation does request a large pothole on Doyle Road is resurfaced, however, this is not a material planning consideration.

Item 6.3: 18/03780/FUL - 836 - 838 London Road, Thornton Heath, CR7 7PA

- An amended ground floor plan has been provided to include cycle parking within the footprint of the building. This would be accessed the proposed residential corridor at ground floor and would provide 4 cycle parking spaces.
- The drawing numbers should be amended to read: RSD2202-500 Rev D and SD2202-001
- Two additional conditions should be added to para 2.2 as follows:

13) Submission of details of measures to restrict access (except for maintenance purposes) from the first floor to the ground floor rear extension roof. Details to be installed prior to occupation

14) Submission of detailed design and specification of the proposed flue and ducting to the rear of the building.

Item 6.4: 18/02880/ful - 44 Beulah Road CR7 8JA

- Replace the following in paragraph 3.7 from

Adjoining the site to the north is a two storey semi-detached house (no 46).
to

Adjoining the site to the north is a two storey detached house (no 46).

Replace the following sentence in paragraph 8.24 from

The applicant is to meet the cost of any new access improvements associated with the development. Furthermore the introduction of visibility splays would ensure that vehicles leaving the site in forward gear..

to

The applicant is to meet the cost of any new access improvements associated with the development. Furthermore the introduction of visibility splays would ensure pedestrian safety.

- An additional supporting Independent Daylight and Sunlight Technical Report produce by Energy Council, dated 28th November 2018, has been received. It has undertaken an assessment of the potential reduction in daylight / sunlight to both neighbouring properties (42 Beulah Road and 46 Beulah Road) as a result of the new development.

The report concludes that the impact to all of the tested windows is minimal and fully accords with the BRE criteria, although there is a minor non-conformity to the window serving the ground floor single-storey extension of 46 Beulah Road, however, the difference is likely to be imperceptible by the occupants. (Officer comment: This window is also supplemented by light from the front of the building to a through lounge).

Item 6.5: 18/04047/FUL - Land adjoining Norbury Railway Station, Norbury Avenue, SW16 3RW

- One additional representation from Steve Reed OBE MP
Member of Parliament for Croydon North

Objection to the application to build flats on land adjacent to Norbury Station.

This land was previously natural woodland until it was sold by British Rail. The trees were felled at very short notice before the land was sold, leaving residents with insufficient time to voice their objections. Precious green space in this heavily built-up area of Norbury has been lost in order to allow its new owners to profit from selling it for development. We cannot allow a precedent to be set that prioritises profit over people's need for green space, trees and protection of the natural environment in our urban neighbourhoods.

The local community has set up a Community Land Trust to demonstrate their determination to protect the site for the benefit of the local community. There are four residents' associations that are highly active in Norbury and attract high levels of participation by local people. All four are objecting to this application and have the support of local elected councillors. There is little support for the application, it sets a damaging precedent, and would negatively impact the local neighbourhood if it were to go ahead.

I urge members of committee to reject this application.

(Officers comment: The land is no longer designated as Open Land under the current CLP 2018 and there are no trees subject to TPO on this site The sale or otherwise of the land is a matter for the landowner. There are no planning policy reasons to justify the compulsory purchase of the site.)

- Replace Condition 12 with the following:-
D8 to B8

- Replace Condition 20 with the following:

The proposed flats in the three-storey core are to be built in accordance with Part M4(2) while the flats in the four-storey core are to be built in accordance with Part M4(3)

to

The proposed flats in the four-storey core are to be built in accordance with Part M4(2) and Part M4(3)

- Replace the following sentence within paragraph 8.22 change from

The four-storey core providing lift access to the upper floors of 8 flats would be Part M4(3) (Wheelchair user dwellings) whilst the remaining 4 units would be Part M4(2) (Accessible and adaptable) within the three-storey element.

to

The four-storey core providing lift access to the upper floors of 8 flats would be Part M4(2) (Accessible and adaptable) and M4(3) (Wheelchair user dwellings).

Item 6.6: 18/03582/FUL – 14 Mitchley Avenue, Purley, CR8 1DT

- The following line within Paragraph 8.24 which reads

“It is noted that the report incorrectly refers to Window 1 of this neighbouring property as north facing as this is indeed north facing.”

Shall be replaced with:

“It is noted that the report incorrectly refers to Window 1 of this neighbouring property as north facing as this is indeed west facing.”

- Add paragraph 8.34a as follows:

“8.34a The proposal has incorporated a bin store adjacent to the car parking area accessed from Mitchley Avenue. The submitted plans have shown that the store is capable of accommodating a sufficient capacity of waste for the proposed development. Further details of the bin stores appearance, proportions and materials are secured by condition.”

- One further letter of objection has been received. The following issues have been raised:

Not in keeping with the area amongst predominantly houses and will ruin the uniform style/height of buildings that line the street [Officer comment: This is addressed in paragraphs 8.6 to 8.12 of the main report].

Item 6.7: 18/00144/FUL – 1 Addington Road, CR2 8RE

- Amended drawings have been received which make minor changes as follows:
 - Rooflights to front elevations of houses raised: This raises no significantly different considerations regarding design and allows for better internal light and outlook. No significantly changed impact on neighbours privacy. Condition 1 updated to refer to current drawings.

- Landscaping around Vicarage: Sub-divided to allow for private amenity space to ground floor units and identification of communal area and playspace: This improves the amenity of the ground floor uses and provides further details of the landscaping, which is considered positive.
- The drawings numbers are now as follows: 12-44/P/201 B, 12-44/P/202 E, 12-44/P/203 F, 12-44/P/204 C, 12-44/P/208, 12-44/P/205B, 12-44/P/206 D, 12-44/P/207D, 12-44/P/208, ITP-204-1-03/P1, ITP-204-4-01/P1, ITP-204-5-01/P1
- Updates to report:
 - Para 8.9 incorrectly identifies the density matrix and density. As such this should read:
The London Plan density matrix suggests a residential density of between 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare and 35-65 units per hectare for the application site. The current proposal would have a unit and habitable room density of 26 units and 121 habitable rooms per hectare respectively.
 - Para 8.17 incorrectly names Purley Oaks station as “Purley Way station” and does not specify all 5 bus routes in very close proximity to the site. As such, the site is considered to be adequately served by public transport and the scheme provides 1:1 car parking spaces (with one space for a visitor) which is considered appropriate.
 - Paragraph 8.18 of the report sets out that TfL requested a reduction of one parking space to the scheme. On further investigation this request related to a previous iteration to the scheme which had more parking spaces. The levels of parking are considered to be appropriate.