

Planning Committee

Meeting of Croydon Council's Planning Committee held virtually on Thursday 25 March 2021 at 7:30pm via Microsoft Teams.

This meeting was Webcast – and is available to view via the Council's Web Site

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Chris Clark (Chair);
Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Clive Fraser, Lynne Hale, Toni Letts, Ian Parker, Joy Prince, Scott Roche, Paul Scott and Gareth Streeter

Also Present: Councillors Helen Pollard, Yvette Hopley and Andy Stranack

PART A

40/21 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 25 February 2021 be signed as a correct record.

41/21 **Disclosure of Interest**

There were no disclosures of a pecuniary interest not already registered.

42/21 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

43/21 **Development presentations**

44/21 **20/05696/PRE Various Locations – 158 Sites**

Replacement of existing Croydon bus shelters, freestanding adverts and larger column adverts with the provision of new bus shelters and advertising panels, providing an opportunity to embed 'Smart City' technology and to upgrade the existing paper advertising with digital advertising screens.

Ward: All

Patrick Skingley from Grimshaw and Opama Khan from Croydon Council attended to give a presentation and respond to Members' questions and issues raised for further consideration prior to submission of a planning application.

The main issues raised at this meeting were as follows:

- Concerns were expressed by Members around how antisocial behaviour, graffiti and vandalism would be addressed in the design of the shelters and advertising. The developers advised that tough glass and steel would be used and any issues to arise would be addressed with the contractor. Glazing was to be used predominantly in the shelters to reduce blind spots and CCTV cameras would be present for monitoring incidents through an independent contractor.
- There was a request for rubbish bins to be included and integrated within the design, though the developers informed that this was not possible due to the maintenance and contractual challenges.
- Members asked about shelter capacity and were informed that this was linked to providing shelter for two wheelchair users.
- Questions were raised for clarification of what was meant by the proximity to the existing locations for shelters, and Members were informed that there may be opportunities for small limited movements due to highway arrangements, which was also linked to the poles on the bus stops designated by Transport for London (TFL).
- There was support from Members for the detached advertising panels. There was reassurance from the Council's officer of the Council's ability to process and use data arising from shelters and advertising Panels.
- Members debated the idea of green roofs and Patrick Skingley provided the rationale for not including them, linked to the design and ability to accommodate the technical equipment within the shelter design.
- Members raised concerns around the stand alone digital advertisement creating street clutter particularly in conservation areas, and whether the idea of using existing street infrastructure had been explored. Members heard that much thought was going into how the design of the shelters and advertising panels could be minimised particularly by making them compact and appearing as a family of design. There was also an opportunity for annotations in the glazing of historical images to be included in places of interest.
- Support was expressed by Members by the overall smart city objectives and the capturing of data for the Council.

- Support was expressed by Members for the annotation of the shelters to annotate a Town Centre quarter or a particular place.
- Support was expressed by Members for the ten seconds of sixty seconds available to the Council for communication.
- Members were informed that there was a balance happening throughout the project between a family of design versus having an element of uniqueness for particular locations, which needed to be within the parameters of the contract.
- Members were informed that all shelters were digital and enabled.
- Members queried the consultation process and the factors available to be consulted on.
- Expressions of concerns and support by Members on the family of designs and uniqueness.

The Chair thanked the developers for their presentation.

45/21 **Planning applications for decision**

46/21 **20/05474/FUL 3 Kingswood Way, South Croydon, CR2 8QL**

Demolition of single-family dwelling house and erection of 3x 3-storey terraced houses, 2x 3-storey semi-detached houses and 2x 2-storey semi-detached houses containing 6x-3 bedroom and 1x 2-bedroom homes with associated access, car parking, cycle and refuse storage.

Ward: Selsdon Vale and Forestdale

The officers presented details of the planning application and responded to questions for clarification.

Mr Martin Rutherford spoke against the application.

Mr Chris Moore, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The referring Ward Member Councillor Andy Stranack spoke against the application.

The Committee deliberated on the application presentation heard before them having heard all the speakers who addressed the Committee, and in turn addressed their view on the matter.

Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel proposed for the landscaping in condition 7 to incorporate rain gardens and for condition 3 to include highway condition surveys.

The substantive motion to **GRANT** the application based on the officer's recommendation in addition to the amended conditions was taken to the vote having been proposed by Councillor Paul Scott. This was seconded by Councillor Joy Prince.

The substantive motion was carried with six Members voting in favour and four Members voting against.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **GRANT** the application for the development of 3 Kingswood Way, South Croydon, CR2 8QL.

At 9:53pm in accordance to section 2.10 (6) in Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions of the constitution, Councillor Chris Clark proposed the motion to suspend the guillotine and defer the agenda item 20/05326/FUL 37 Kingswood Lane, Warlingham, CR6 9AB to the next Planning Committee meeting. This was unanimously agreed by Members of the Committee. The motion to suspend the guillotine and defer item 20/05326/FUL 37 Kingswood Lane, Warlingham, CR6 9AB to the committee meeting was put forward to the vote and was unanimously approved.

47/21 **20/01953/FUL 219 Farley Road South Croydon CR2 7NQ**

Demolition of existing dwelling house and the construction of a part-single and part-four-storey building comprising 9 flats, with associated vehicle and cycle parking, refuse store, hard and soft landscaping.

Ward: Selsdon and Addington Village

The officers presented details of the planning application and responded to questions for clarification.

Mr David Rutherford spoke on behalf of the Croham Valley Resident's Association against the application.

Mr Grant Freeman, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The referring Ward Member Councillor Helen Pollard spoke against the application.

The Committee deliberated on the application presentation heard before them having heard all the speakers who addressed the Committee, and in turn addressed their view on the matter.

There was a request from Councillor Paul Scott for an additional condition to include a Car Parking Management Plan to ensure that each of the family units obtain a parking space.

The substantive motion to **GRANT** the application based on the officer's recommendation inclusive of the above additional condition was taken to the vote having been proposed by Councillor Paul Scott. This was seconded by Councillor Clive Fraser.

The substantive motion was carried with five Members voting in favour, four Members voting against and one Member abstaining their vote.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **GRANT** the application for the development of 219 Farley Road South Croydon CR2 7NQ.

48/21 **20/05326/FUL 37 Kingswood Lane, Warlingham, CR6 9AB**

Demolition of single-family dwelling house and erection of 1x 3-storey block, containing 4x 3-bedroom, 3x 2-bedroom and 2x 1-bedroom flats with associated access, car parking, cycle and refuse storage.

Ward: Sanderstead

THIS ITEM WAS DEFERRED TO THE NEXT PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING ON THURSDAY 8 APRIL.

49/21 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

50/21 **Other planning matters**

51/21 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

The report was received for information.

The meeting ended at 10.46pm

Signed:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th April 2021

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 - 20/05326/FUL 37 Kingswood Lane CR6 9AB

Since the publishing of the report, an additional 27 written objections have been received. No additional planning considerations not mentioned in the Committee report have been raised in these representations except for the following:

- People need room to work from home. *[Officer Comment: units internally need to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and be of good quality, which officers are satisfied these are]*
- Concerns about the accuracy of submitted visualisations including regarding representation of trees *[Officer Comment: visualisations do not form approved/refused drawings. They are helpful to visualise how the proposal may look but would contain some inaccuracies inherent in their creation. Officers are satisfied that the visualisations are typical of those produced for a scheme such as this but agree that they suggest a more mature existing tree specimens at the front of the site]*
- Concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties – the report misidentifies side facing windows of no.35 as being secondary when one window serves a bathroom and the other is the only window to a study / bedroom. A daylight & sunlight assessment has been received for these windows. The results show there will be a reduction in daylight in Vertical Sky Component terms of 54% from 33% VSC to 15% VSC. In terms of Daylight Distribution there will be a reduction to the study/bedroom of 64% from 97% to 35% of this room able to see the sky at the working plane. These reductions are large and very far beyond the 20% reduction target value set out within the BRE guidelines. *[Officer Comment: the report refers to one of the side facing windows at 35 Kingswood Lane as being a secondary window to a living room however an objector has told us that this serves a study / bedroom. They have confirmed that the layout of this property is with a bedroom to the front (served by a front facing window), a study / bedroom to the side (served by the side facing window mis-identified as a lounge) and the lounge is located to the rear – this is considered further below.]*
- Concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties – 45 degrees line is drawn incorrectly from 41

No additional consideration are required regarding the first two points above. Regarding the third, the clarity is welcomed. Previously officers were satisfied that this would have a minimal impact being a secondary window but the proposal would have an impact on this study / bedroom. However officers are satisfied that this impact would be acceptable; the Suburban Design Guide gives very little protection to side facing windows which directly overlook adjacent sites. It should be noted that the window is located off the boundary by the width of

the garage but the scheme would still impact on the window. However as it serves a study / bedroom, to which it is generally accepted that light is less important, is side facing and faces towards the neighbouring property and the impact on the other windows serving this property is minimal, officers are satisfied that this impact is acceptable.

Regarding the final point, the 45degree line is drawn from the conservatory to no 41. Officers are satisfied that this is appropriate.

Paragraph 7.1 erroneously refers to the previous London Plan and should refer to the London Plan 21.

Item 6.2 - 20/04952/FUL 131 Woodcote Valley Road Purley CR8 3BN

Since the publication of the committee report 17 additional representations have been submitted. One representation has raised concern regarding the presence of reptiles and amphibians on or near to the site. The Preliminary Ecology Appraisal identified that the site had low likelihood of reptiles but, as there was some potential, recommends that a reptile precautionary method statement be adopted. This would be secured by condition. The objections point out that there is a pond within a reasonable distance of the site (20m away in the garden of number 135) which may increase the potential for reptiles and so the precautionary approach is not supported. The PEA has been considered by our specialists who are satisfied that it is acceptable, although it does not refer to the pond in question. The site however has been surveyed for these species including for invertebrates, amphibians and reptiles (as it was known that some had been reported in the wider area) and was not found to support habitats which amphibians would use. It was found to support habitat which common (non protected) invertebrates would use so no actions are required. It was found that reptiles may move around the borders of the site hence the precautionary approach. We are satisfied with the approach taken and conditions recommended

Item 6.3 – 103 to 111A High Street, Croydon, CR0 1QG

Since the publication of the committee report a further eight letters of objection have been received. Only one additional issue was raised in these objections from those previously raised. A summary is shown below.

Comments	Officers' response
Concern that Highway Safety Audit submitted highlights a safety concern.	Highway safety audit, has been reviewed by Council's highway engineers and satisfied that there would not be an increased danger to pedestrians or vehicles. It is important to note that this is only stage 1 highway safety audit, which is preliminary design, and that additional design work would be undertaken, which is likely to include further road safety audits at stages 2 (detailed design), stage 3 (when

	completed) and stage 4 (monitoring) to ensure that what is delivered is safe. This is something that would occur post planning if the scheme was to progress.
--	---

Drawings number corrections

Following drawings:

200 Rev 01, 201 Rev 01, 202 Rev 01, 203 Rev 01, 204 Rev 01, 205 Rev 01, 211 Rev 01, 218 Rev 01, 230 Rev 01, 231 Rev 01, 300 Rev 01, 400 Rev 01, 401 Rev 01 and 402 Rev 01

Replaced with:

200 Rev 02, 201 Rev 02, 202 Rev 02, 203 Rev 02, 204 Rev 02, 205 Rev 02, 211 Rev 02, 218 Rev 02, 230 Rev 02, 231 Rev 02, 300 Rev 02, 400 Rev 02, 401 Rev 02 and 402 Rev 02.

In Table above paragraph 1.1 the Total number of four bed units should be 4.

The final line of paragraph 9.78 should read 'Given those windows on sixth to eighth floor are secondary Living/Kitchen/Dining Room windows, the impact of the development on these windows light is acceptable.

Figure 14 is deleted. Correct data already shown in Figure 11.

This page is intentionally left blank