

## Planning Committee

Meeting held on Thursday, 14 September 2023 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,  
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

### MINUTES

**Present:** Councillor Ian Parker  
Councillor Clive Fraser (Vice-Chair);  
Councillors Simon Brew, Chris Clark, Lara Fish, Mohammed Islam,  
Mark Johnson, Humayun Kabir, Luke Shortland and Appu Srinivasan

**Also Present:** Councillor Michael Neal

**Apologies:** Councillors Michael Neal and Sean Fitzsimons

### PART A

#### 35/23 Minutes of Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 18 May 2023 and Thursday, 8 June 2023 as accurate records.

#### 36/23 Disclosure of Interest

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

#### 37/23 Urgent Business (if any)

There was none.

#### 38/23 Appointments

**Resolved** to appoint Councillors Leila Ben-Hassel, Mohammed Islam and Appu Srinivasan.

39/23 **Planning applications for decision**

40/23 **22/03825/FUL - 111 - 113 Brighton Road, South Croydon CR2 6EE**

This item was withdrawn.

41/23 **22/00638/FUL - Hotel, 22 St Peter's Road, Croydon, CR0 1HD**

Conversion of existing hotel to 6no. residential units including internal reconfiguration and external alterations and changes to boundary treatment, and construction of a detached three storey dwellinghouse on the site, facing Aberdeen Road.

Ward: South Croydon

The officer presented details of the planning application and in response to members' questions explained that:

- The requirement for storage space was the same for any new residential unit created. There was no storage requirement for units 1 to 6 because it was conversion scheme which made minor changes to the envelope of the building.
- There was work being done internally to accommodate for the six units but given that the weight was being given to the conversion scheme, officer found it acceptable that the developer has not provided storage space.
- The units were oversized, which compensated for the lack of private amenity space and storage space provided.
- The London plan policy T6.1 set out different residential units in comparison to the PTAL. The site of the proposed development had a PTAL rating of 5 and London policy stated that if the area had a PTAL rating of 5 or 6 then it should be a car free development.
- The development was in a controlled parking zone so there were powers to restrict future occupiers from gaining parking permits which would also reduce parking stress.
- There was no policy protection for the hotel on the site, hence why the loss of the hotel was deemed to be acceptable.
- The section 106 agreement would provide three years of car club membership per unit. The sustainable transport contribution was £10,500 and would contribute to the provision of car club bays in the area.
- As there would not be any wheelchair accessible units in the development, there would be no provision for disabled parking bays. The removal of parking permits would exclude blue badge holder so individuals need to use disabled bays in the area would be excluded from the controlled parking zone (CPZ).
- There were three CPZ's in the area.

- The car club bays could be provided across the borough and not just outside of the CPZ's.

Roger Maile spoke in objection to the application, Oliver Lazarus spoke in support of the application and the ward Member Councillor Michael Neal addressed the Committee with his view on the application. After the speakers had finished, the committee began the deliberation, during which they raised the following points:

- It was accepted that there was no policy protecting the car park and for the land to continue to host a hotel.
- There was some doubt about the practicality of the car club.
- The house was policy compliant but appeared to be squeezed into a tight area.
- Members wanted to keep the fence at the same height and to replace any trees lost to maintain privacy of residents.
- A car club would need to be placed closer to the development.
- The 20m difference in the space between the development and residential houses was an increase and was welcomed.
- It was noted that the application had been to pre application stage and the applicant had made sure to adhere to the feedback provided.
- There was a need for more family homes within the borough.
- There was some concern of the shape of the house which appeared slightly squashed.
- There was still a need for hotels however there was also a great need for more family home units.
- There was some concern over the size of some of the units which were smaller than some members would have liked.
- The development did not fit in with the character of the local area despite the scheme being policy compliant.

The substantive motion to GRANT the application based on the officer's recommendation, in addition to a condition relating to the requirement for full details on the northern boundary treatment (the height of which should be maintained), and the location of replacement trees along the western boundary was proposed by Councillor Shortland. This was seconded by Councillor Johnson.

The motion to grant the application was taken to a vote and carried with 10 Members voting in favour. The Committee RESOLVED to GRANT the application subject to completion of a legal agreement for the development at Hotel, 22 St Peter's Road, Croydon, CR0 1HD.

#### 42/23 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

43/23 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

The report was received for information.

The meeting ended at 7.31 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:**

.....

.....