

PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019

**- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA –**

Item 5.1 18/04184/PRE - Land to the South East of Croydon College

- Para 4.2 should be amended as follows: Block D should be 8-13 storeys (not 9-13) and Block E is 12 storeys (not 13).

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019

**- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -**

Item 6.1 18/05858/FUL - 6A The Drive

- Section 1 (Drawing Nos) updated to the following drawings:

PL\_005 Revision 6, PL\_99 02 Revision 6, PL\_99\_02 Revision 6, PL\_100 02 Revision 6, PL\_101 02 Revision 6, PL\_102 02 Revision 6, PL\_103 02, PL\_50 02 Revision 6, PL\_200 03 Revision 6, PL\_300 03 Revision 6, PL\_202 03 Revision 6, PL\_203 03 Revision 6, Amended Tree Report, Amended Tree Schedule, Amended Tree Constraints Plans, Topographical Survey, Design and Access Statement, Day and Sunlight Report, Flood Risk Assessment and Parking Stress Survey.

Amended plans have been received making minor changes to landscaping and bin storage at the front of the site.

- Paragraph 2.2 updated to include a condition to provide the cycle store as shown on the plans; and the provision of an accessible cycle groove.
- 6.2 refers to the property as a bungalow, for clarity, the existing property is a two-storey property. To the rear of the site, given the change in land levels, the property appears as a bungalow with accommodation in the roof space; at the front, the property reads as two-storeys. The proposed property is a three/four storey building with accommodation in the roof and at lower ground.
- Paragraph 8.20 refers to the 'internal layouts' of the units meeting accessibility standards. For the avoidance of doubt, the units would not comply with the standards of M4 as the building is accessed via steps. This is considered acceptable, given the minor nature of the development and that the existing site slopes and the intrusive impact that ramps would have at the front of the site. It is of some merit that units internally can be navigated by wheelchair users or other less able to walk and this is considered to be acceptable.
- With regards to paragraph 8.23, Nos 6 and 8 The Drive both have attic bedroom windows which face onto the application site. No 6 also has a ground floor secondary living room window, which is screened by the boundary treatment. There is no window at first floor level. No 8 has a single storey side addition with a flank wall which abuts the application site. At first floor level there is a small narrow window which is a secondary window in the corner of a bedroom. The consideration of the impact on the bedrooms, the only principal window to habitable rooms is as set out in paragraph 8.23

- For the avoidance of doubt the properties at 19 and 19a Vale Close are sited approximately 35 metres away from the proposal and so there would be no significant impact on light, outlook or privacy.

Item 6.2 18/04516/FUL Rear of 156 To 180 Addington Road

- Section 1 (Description of development) updated to remove A1, A2 and D1 uses. The live work unit will only have B1 (a) Offices or B1(b) Research and Development or B1(c) Light Industrial use on the ground floor, and residential above.
- Section 1 (Drawing Numbers) updated as follows:  
  
6699-PL01, 6699-PL02 Rev C, 6699-PL03 Rev B, C10903B, C10904B, Environmental Statement, Contaminated Land Report, Noise Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment and Design and Access Statement.
- Paragraph 2.2 Condition added to restrict the use of the live/work unit to a mixed use unit falling within use classes C3 and B1 (a), B1 (b) and B1(c) uses; and to ensure the live/work property is used as a single unit.
- New Paragraph 3.10 added: Application 19/00157/CONR submitted relating to the JD Wetherspoons pub to increase the hours of operation to 2330 Monday to Thursday and midnight on Friday and Saturday nights. This application is under consideration.
- Para 6.1 updated with one further objection received on behalf of JD Wetherspoon PC who operate a public house at 152-154 Addington Road. The following concerns were raised:
  - 1) Impact on residential amenity of future occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance from JD Wetherspoons and commercial uses [Officer Comment: In view of the separation distances afforded, urban grain of the locality and design of the properties, Officers are satisfied that the scheme would not lead to an poor quality living environment for future occupiers].
  - 2) Noise survey submitted by the applicant was undertaken outside of busy times [Officer Comment: Officers are satisfied that the submitted survey sets out the context of the development site and provides guidance on the mitigation measures necessary. To ensure that the residential units are designed to achieve the necessary internal noise standards, a further noise assessment is recommended required by condition. Any remedial measures required to maintain a suitable internal environment will be provided].
  - 3) Concern as to the of construction on the operation of the pub [Officer Comment: This will be controlled and managed through a construction management plan required to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development].

- 4) Proposed development should not prejudice any development coming forward or an extension of operating hours at JD Wetherspoons [Officer Comment: Each application is determined on its own merits. We cannot discuss the detail of application 19/00517/CONR (variation of condition to extend opening hours) as it is still being assessed].

Item 6.3 - 18/03320/FUL 40-60, 42 & 42A Cherry Orchard Road, Croydon, CR0 6BA

Remove reference to 'with basement' in the second bullet point of paragraph 4.1.

A further representation has been received from Cllr Fitzsimons which is summarised as follows:

- 1) Rent and Service Charge information is lacking for the affordable units.
- 2) What type of tenancies will Sage be granting and will they meet minimum standards of security of tenure?
- 3) Balconies: there was a strong steer from the committee previously about this issue. I can't see any changes made and they still seem to be metal railings. I would like to know whether the committee is allow to agree a condition (assuming it wanted to) for further discussion on balcony design to increase resident privacy and improve the look of the balconies with a better design.
- 4) Public Realm: Welcome the improvements but there should be an upgrade to the path all the way to From Cherry Orchard Road to Oval Road to improve access for residents of the scheme who want to access their homes via Oval Road, and also for the residents of Oval Road and the school. This should be included in the 278 works. Plus can you re-assure that this will be marked as a public right of way.
- 5) Affordable housing is below 35%. The council is wrong in its assessment to allow 20% margin for the developer, a slightly lower figure could have increased the current proposed figure. The link to the second independent assessment does work.
- 6) CIL and Section 106: Consideration to be given that this is ring-fenced to help upgrade the rest of Cherry Orchard Road, pavement in particular as in poor condition.

Item 6.4: 18/03342/FUL – 2 More Close, Purley

- One additional representation was received objecting to the development. The issues raised are already covered in the officer report.
- Section 1 (Drawing numbers) updated:

1453-PL1310 C, 1453-PL1311 C, 1453-PL1312 A

A minor correction to the first floor roof on the western side of the building and a clearer CGI image were provided.

- Paragraph 8.7 refers to an application under consideration at 3 More Close, the adjoining site. That proposal is under consideration and no decision has been made on the proposal.
- Paragraph 8.16 and 6.2 (representations received) refer to the amount of parking proposed. Officers are satisfied that the amended proposal of 6 parking spaces is appropriate given the location in close proximity to Purley District Centre. It should be noted that a parking stress survey was not carried out for this proposal but has been for 3 More Close which concluded that the average parking stress levels overnight on a weekday are 37-40%. Parking stress is generally deemed as high when there is an 85% saturation, so the results suggest that parking saturation levels on local roads are not reached. The Transport Statement also highlights that More Close has single yellow line parking restrictions on both sides of the carriageway restricting parking between the hours of 1pm and 2pm Monday to Friday, as does the nearest section of Russell Hill which also has some 'pay and display' parking bays. The level of parking is considered to be acceptable.

Item 6.5 18/05204/FUL – Land and parking adjoining 2 The Lawns to include land to the rear of 142-148 Beauchamp Road

- Section 1.0 the drawing numbers should be updated to: 002 REV A, 201 REV B, 202 REV B, 203 REV A, 301 REV 1, 302 REV B, 303 REV A, 304 REV A
- Amended plans were received to correct an error on the elevations, provide an additional parking space and wider planting bed to the south east boundary.
- An additional paragraph should be added to the principle section after paragraph 7.6 to read:

'Part of the application site used to form part of the garden to 142 Beauchamp Road and therefore Local Plan policy DM10.4(e) is relevant. This states that in the case of development in the grounds of an existing building which is retained, a minimum length of 10m and no less than half or 200m<sup>2</sup> (whichever is the smaller) of the existing garden area should be retained for the host property after subdivision of the garden. The remaining garden would measure 105sqm and would be less than half and therefore does not comply with this policy. However, the garden would be deeper than 12m which complies with the first part of the policy. The remaining garden depth and size would provide a good sized garden which would be a similar size to other existing gardens in the area. The subdivision of the plot is therefore considered acceptable in this case.'

- In paragraph 7.20 reference to 3 and 5 The Lawns should be 4 and 6 The Lawns.
- Paragraph 7.21 should be replaced with the following paragraph:

'Local Plan Policy DM10.6(c) states that development should not result in direct overlooking of private outdoor space within 10m perpendicular to the rear elevation of a dwelling. The garden at no. 2 The Lawns is 11m long (at its closest point to the development). The positioning of the windows within House 2 would result in windows facing onto this garden within 10m of the rear of this neighbouring

property. However, as stated above the separation distance and the orientation of the buildings would reduce any overlooking to this neighbour's garden. A degree of mutual overlooking from first floor windows is part of the character of this suburban area. In addition, a large planting bed is proposed along this boundary which would include the planting of new trees (a suitable landscaping scheme would be secured by condition). Overall the relationship is considered acceptable and would not be uncommon for this suburban situation.'

- The relationship with the properties along Spa Hill and Beauchamp Road is considered acceptable under Local Plan policy DM10.6(c). Any overlooking would be limited to the rear of the neighbouring gardens.

This page is intentionally left blank