

Planning Sub-Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 11 August 2022 at 7.00 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Joseph Lee, Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Vice-Chair); Councillors Chris Clark, Mark Johnson, Humayun Kabir, and Luke Shortland

Apologies: Councillor Michael Neal, Ian Parker, Sean Fitzsimons, Clive Fraser, Karen Jewitt, Endri Llabuti, Ellily Ponnuthurai and Holly Ramsey

PART A

A32/22 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

A33/22 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

A34/22 **Planning applications for decision**

There was one planning application presented before the Sub-Committee for decision which involved the following:

Outline application for the consideration of access, appearance, layout and scale only in relation to the erection of two buildings comprising a total of 4 semi-detached houses, formation of vehicular access and provision of associated parking, refuse and bicycle storage fronting Ballards Rise.

A35/22 **21/05664/OUT - Rear of 35 & 37 Croham Valley Road**

Ward: South Croydon

Natalie Rowland, Principal Planning Officer (Planning and Sustainable Regeneration), presented the application to the Sub-Committee and highlighted to members that:

- The addendum which had been published shortly before the committee met that day had produced the results of the parking stress survey, which was 42 per cent;
- There was a high risk of surface water flooding in the area but that the application would be subject to a pre-commencement condition regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs);
- The development site was built on a sloping road;
- A development opposite the site of this application had been approved for the erection of eight flats across two buildings;
- The application proposed six car parking spaces and cycle storage for all units;
- There were windows planned which would face a pathway which ran between the houses, which would allow light into the buildings but would be obscure glazed so as not to cause any privacy issues;
- There would be a compliance condition in place for visibility displays from the car parks to the road for which the developer would be responsible and to which the Transport Officer had no objections.

The Sub-Committee heard two representations against the application, and one representation on behalf of the applicant, which made the following points:

- 49 residents and the MP had objected to the planning application;
- The proposal was bulky, overbearing, and incompatible with the street scene;
- The buildings would tower over neighbouring properties due to the incline of the hill;
- The lack of sight-lines from the car park would compromise highway safety;
- There was a lack of consideration for the impact that a potential 24 extra residents would cause to the local amenities, especially since eight flats were being built opposite;
- That there was an acute need in the area for family housing and this development proposed to provide ample family housing;
- The development was designed to be traditional and complement the area and new development opposite;
- That there was sufficient separation from neighbouring properties to ensure privacy was retained;
- That there was ample car and cycle parking and that the location was well connected via public transport.

In response officers explained that regarding overlooking the gardens of some of the neighbouring properties was not an issue as the rear of the development site was lower down the hill than the property concerned. The distances from the properties also complied with Greater London Authority (GLA) guidance, and regarding the transport matter, a footpath had been installed on the opposite side of the street as part of the development of the eight flats opposite.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Clark proposed and Councillor Kabir seconded the officer's recommendation with three in favour and 3 against. The Chair used his casting vote to **REFUSE** the application, on the grounds that it was out of character and that it would bring harm to neighbours due to dominance because of the changes in land level. The Committee voted 3 in favour, 3 against, with the Chair using his casting vote against, so planning permission was **REFUSED** for development at the Rear of 35 and 37 Croham Valley Road.

The meeting ended at 8.41 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....