

PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Thursday 09 July 2020

## - ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

### Item 5.1 – 19 Downsview Road

Amendments made to landscaping scheme and additional details/sectional plans of tree planting have been provided. These (primarily) constitute the planting of 3 additional trees within in consultation with the Council Tree Officer. Additional Trees are shown circled in red on the amended landscaping plan below (more details will be on committee presentation).

PLANTING SCHEDULE					
Trees					
Number	Species	Height	Girth	Specification	Details
2	Acer campestre	400-450cm	14-18cm	Extra Heavy Standard, 5 trunks, 3x, 80, Clear Stem min. 200cm	Circle 1
1	Amelanchier lamarckii	200-250cm	10-12cm	Multi-stemmed Bushy, 3 stems min. 2x, 80	Circle 2
2	Prunus Hillieri Spier	400-450cm	14-16cm	Extra Heavy Standard, 5 trunks, 3x, 80, Clear Stem 175-200cm	Circle 3
1	Pyrus calleryana 'Redspire'	400-450cm	14-16cm	Extra Heavy Standard, 5 trunks, 3x, 80, Clear Stem 175-200cm	Circle 4



**Item 5.2 – 4 More Close, Purley CR8 2JN**

Paragraph 2.1:

- BREEAM condition to be added prior to occupation.
- Following the publication of the report, the applicant agreed to include measures to make the lower communal areas accessible and adaptable for future use. These measures would include reinforced side walls for a podium lift along the stairs and side access and potential widening of the staircase. Accordingly, the ‘Accessible Homes’ compliance condition would be amended to include adapting the communal area accessibility.

Paragraph 6.2: Second objection response under ‘*Principle of development*’ stated in error that the proposal would have two three-bedroom flats. The second objection should read as below:

No replacement to the existing family home.	The proposal would have 30% family units when including two-bedroom flats; additionally one unit would be three-bedroom flat with direct access to private rear amenity.
---	--

Fig.7 – correction as it included wrong placement of adjoining properties Nos 2 & 3, it should be as follows:



Paragraphs 8.39 – clarification adding the word ‘maximum’; it should read as follows:  
... Accordingly, the proposal would fall short by one space than the **maximum** DLP standards and three spaces less than 1:1 provision.

Paragraphs 8.41 – correction to the amount of accumulative overspill to 10.5 instead of 11.5 vehicles; it should read as follows: ... These developments would result in 54 flats with overspill of **10.5** vehicles. While future residents might use walking and cycling during the week to access shops, rail, buses and local facilities, this would not preclude their ownership of private vehicles.

**Item 5.3 – 1 More Close, Purley CR8 2JN**

Paragraph 2.2:

Condition 13 to be detailed to include ‘adaptable and accessible’ for Unit 2 and ‘accessible’ for units 1 and 3.

Paragraph 6.2:

Second objection response under ‘*Principle of development*’ stated in error that the proposal would have two three-bedroom flats. The second objection should read as below:

No replacement to the existing family home.	The proposal would have 30% family-sized units when including two-bedroom flats; additionally one unit would be three-bedroom flat with direct access to private rear amenity.
---	--

Paragraph 8.6 – correction regarding number of family-sized units; it should read as follows: Loss of Existing Land Use: Policy DM1.2 of the CLP (2018) permits residential redevelopment where it would not result in the net loss of three-bedroom homes or the loss of homes smaller than 130 sq. The proposal would provide **one** three-bedroom **dwelling** following the demolition of one family home with an existing area of 190sqm accordingly, it would not result in a net loss of three-bedroom homes smaller than 130 sq. and the proposal would be acceptable.

Paragraphs 8.11 – correction as paragraph stated 1A More Close instead of 1B More Close; it should read as follows: The proposed layout would follow the existing building line and match that of No.1**B** More Close. It would surpass No.5’s; ...

Paragraphs 8.28 – correction as paragraph stated 1A More Close instead of 1B More Close, it should read as follows: The site borders No.1**B** to the north and No.5 to the west.

Paragraphs 8.35 – clarification to car park locations; it should read as follows: Vehicle Parking: The site falls within PTAL 3, it has an existing crossover. The proposal would comprise three vehicle parking spaces to **the west side of the building** and three vehicle parking spaces to **the south side of the building**. Each set of parking would have its dedicated entrance with the **west side** parking area maintaining the existing crossover on site. The **south side** area parking area would have a new crossover at a distance of 15.4 metres from the corner of the highway which would allow for appropriate visibility splays to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety in the area.

Paragraphs 8.36 – clarification adding the word ‘maximum’; it should read as follows: ... Accordingly, the proposal would fall short by one space than the **maximum** DLP standards and three spaces less than 1:1 provision.

Paragraphs 8.37 – correction to the amount of accumulative overspill to 10.5 instead of 11.5 vehicles; it should read as follows: ... These developments would result in 54 flats with overspill of **10.5** vehicles. While future residents might use walking and cycling during the week to access shops, rail, buses and local facilities, this would not preclude their ownership of private vehicles.

#### **Item 5.4 – 6 More Close, Purley CR8 2JN**

Following the publication of the report, the Council received amended revisions for the proposed floor plans, these amendments did not change anything in the proposed floor plans and only referred to the drawing titles to reflect the correct levels for the lower-than-ground floors the proposal. The list of Drawing Numbers will now read as follows:

Drawing Nos: E000, E001, E009, E010, E011, E012, E030 Rev A, E031, P001 Rev D, P007 Rev C, P008 Rev C, P009 Rev C, P010 Rev C, P011 Rev B, P012 Rev B, P013 Rev B, P014 Rev D, P030 Rev E, P031 Rev D, P032 Rev A, P033, P040 Rev C, P041 Rev D, P042 Rev C.

Paragraph 2.1:

- BREEAM condition to be added prior to occupation.
- Details for cycle and refuse stores to be submitted prior to occupation.
- Following the publication of the report, the applicant agreed to include measures to make the lower communal area accessible and adaptable for future use. These measures would include reinforced side walls along the stairs and side access to allow for a podium lift. Accordingly, the 'Accessible Homes' compliance condition would be amended to include adapting the communal area accessibility.

Paragraph 6.2:

Second objection response under '*Principle of development*' stated in error that the proposal would have two three-bedroom flats. The second objection should read as below:

No replacement to the existing family home.	The proposal would have 60% family-sized units when including two-bedroom flats; additionally three units would be three-bedroom flats.
---	---

Fourth objection response under '*Principle of development*' contained an error; it should read as below:

Over intensification of More Close due to the number of developments within its boundaries.	Most of the developments are not presenting significant overdevelopment on their own merits, the Council is taking certain measures to overcome impact on traffic, loss of single family dwelling is mitigated by providing family-sized units with direct access to rear gardens/large private amenity areas.
---	--

Second objection response under '*Traffic & Parking*' stated in error that the proposal would have six car parking spaces. The second objection should read as below:

The proposed four parking spaces would not be sufficient.	Amended drawings provided four car parking spaces in total. The planning permission would include s.106 obligations to avoid impact on parking in the area.
---	---

Paragraphs 8.37 – clarification adding the word 'maximum'; it should read as follows: ... Accordingly, the proposal would fall short by one space than the **maximum** DLP standards and three spaces less than 1:1 provision.

Paragraphs 8.39 – correction to the amount of accumulative overspill to 10.5 instead of 11.5 vehicles; it should read as follows: ... These developments would result in 54 flats with overspill of **10.5** vehicles. While future residents might use walking and

cycling during the week to access shops, rail, buses and local facilities, this would not preclude their ownership of private vehicles.