

Planning Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 30 November 2017 at 5.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Paul Scott (Chair);
Councillor Joy Prince (Acting Vice-Chair);
Councillors Maggie Mansell, Jamie Audsley, Sherwan Chowdhury,
Luke Clancy, Bernadette Khan, Jason Perry, Sue Winborn and Chris Wright

Also Present: Councillor Donald Speakman

Apologies: Councillor Humayun Kabir

PART A

A192/17 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2017 be signed as a correct record.

A193/17 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

A194/17 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

A195/17 **Development presentations**

There were none.

A196/17 **5.1 Coulsdon Schemes**

Ward: Coulsdon West

(a) 17/02536/PRE CALAT Centre, Malcolm Road, Coulsdon CR5 2DB
Creation of a new community hub consisting enhanced community centre with theatre and NHS health facility, together with associated parking

Colm Lacey (Brick-by-Brick Croydon Ltd) and Helen Reid (Pitman Tozer, architects for CALAT and Coulsdon Community Centre sites) attended to give the presentations 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:

- Is adequate provision made for parking?
- Contemporary vs traditional approach to theatre building
- Relationship between NHS and re-provided CCC needs to work
- Need to ensure space works for CCC
- Zodiac gym needs relocation
- Energy requirements important
- Parking and disabled provision
- Need NHS to show commitment to scheme
- Ensuring the healthcare facility designation secured
- A keenness to see community facilities coming into the town centre and the NHS hub to be provided

(b) 17/02589/PRE Coulsdon Community Centre, Chipstead Valley, Coulsdon CR5 3BE

Demolition of existing building and redevelopment for residential units to provide 22 3-bed houses and 3 2-bed bungalows

Colm Lacey (Brick-by-Brick Croydon Ltd) and Helen Reid (Pitman Tozer, architects for CALAT and Coulsdon Community Centre sites) attended to give the presentations 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:

- Releasing site for 33 houses supported
- Support for development design – interesting scheme
- Linear form of development – can be challenging
- Will the garages actually be utilised?
- Potential for car ports over garages
- Reasonable amount of parking proposed
- The importance of a balance between sufficient parking and houses and other community facilities which are desperately needed

(c) 17/00054/PRE Car Park, Lion Green Road, Coulsdon CR5 2NL

Erection of 157 residential units consisting five individual sculpted pavilions sitting within a landscaped area with 52 residential car parking spaces, 100 space public car park, cycle stores, refuse stores, landscaping and public realm works, access and other associated works.

Colm Lacey (Brick-by-Brick Croydon Ltd) and Mary Duggan (Mary Duggan Associates) attended to give the presentations 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:

- Importance of mixed and balanced communities
- Landscaping – is it public or private

- Archaeological surveys needed
- Impacts on SAM
- Parking a real concern
- Tree planting encouraged
- Children's play space required
- Potential for overlooking to Lion Green Road
- Soft landscaped edge interesting
- Welcomed the design
- 50% affordable support
- Challenge of residential vs parking
- Could more parking be provided on the site
- Lack of retail provision on the site
- Need for family units

The Chair, Councillor Paul Scott emphasised the following points for consideration in relation to the 3 overall sites:

- Will the facilities provided be adequate for the community uses now and for the future?
- Ensuring the healthcare facility designation secured
- Onsite parking and the wider impact
- Important to look at parking across the 3 sites
- Suitability of a more modern design
- Linkages for the shared spaces
- Look forward to application submissions

Councillor Jeet Bains, ward Member for Coulsdon West, raised the following concerns expressed by local residents:

- No objection to facilities for families and people of all affordabilities.
- Importance of local needs being understood.
- Issue of parking: It is a popular shopping area and the status must be retained. An independent traffic expert should check the details.
- Cane Hill impacts must be factored into Transport Assessments
- Concern about approval with too little parking provision. People will buy cars whether parking is provided or not. The parking issue must not be compromised.
- Linkage between the sites needs careful planning as the community centre is distinct, with a historical background. Links must not be only on the pretext of providing more housing.

At 7:35pm there was a short break.

A197/17 Planning applications for decision

The meeting recommenced at 7:45pm.

A198/17 6.3 17/04201/FUL Former Essex House, George Street, Croydon CR0 1PJ

Redevelopment of the site to provide a part 38 and part 44 storey building with 546 residential flats, with the ground floor to incorporate a flexible space including cafe (Class A3), business space (Class B1) and gallery space (Class D1) uses with basement accommodating 28 disabled parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse storage, and associated hard and soft landscaping
Ward: Fairfield

Following the presentation, Members raised issues of uses at ground level, children's play space, meeting and communal areas for young people and the high amount of cycle spaces. Officers explained that there would be a variety of ground floor retail uses, 40 square metres of children's play space and the travel plan will consider the cycle spaces and the possibility of alternative uses. The residential units are aimed at the young professional rental market. There will be an area with tree planting and benches.

The Director of Planning and Strategic Transport added that there were very generous quantities of private communal amenity space, including the rooftops.

In response to a query about access in the residential buildings, Members were assured that there will be one staircase in each building for use by all residents.

Simon Toplis, Simon Owen and Simon Bayliss (HTA Design LLP) spoke on behalf of the applicant and emphasised the following points:

- Building will be completed within 2 years
- Pushing forward regeneration
- Minimal disruption
- Delivered 4 schemes within last 6 years
- Modular build higher quality and more detailed
- More amenity space
- Pioneering firm
- Queries - wheelchair - adaptable/accessible - same in layout - but not put in kitchen unit etc but easy to adapt in future.
- Roofspace will be enjoyed by residents and their friends.
- Each unit has a utility room including a washing machine

Members expressed approval of this positive scheme with a good percentage of affordable housing, good cladding and interesting winter garden ideas. They were keen to see it come forward.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Jamie Audsley proposed and Councillor Paul Scott seconded the officer's recommendation and the Committee voted unanimously in favour (10), so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at former Essex House, George Street Croydon CR0 1PJ.

A199/17 **6.5 17/03208/FUL 49-51 Beulah Hill, Upper Norwood, London SE19 3DS**

Demolition of two existing buildings: erection of a part 6, part 7 storey building (Block A) and part 4, part 5 and part 6 storey building (Block B) comprising a total of 30 flats (5 x 1-bedroom; 17 x 2-bedroom; 6 x 3-bedroom; and 2 x 4-bedroom flats) and a 2-storey building (Block C) comprising 3 x 3-bedroom townhouses with the provision of 17 car parking spaces (including wheelchair accessible parking), 60 cycle parking spaces, refuse and recycling area, associated landscaped communal amenity areas and formation of vehicular access

Ward: Upper Norwood

Members queried the design, regarding the number of storeys. Officers explained that the revision broke up the massing so there is not a wall on the corner. Having two storeys there reflected the buildings in the area.

Mr Ben Lenders, representing St Valery residents (opposite the site), spoke in objection and raised the following concerns:

- Density: London Plan exceeded, with massing which will impact on
- Heritage: The aesthetics are not in line with the street scene
- Overlooking: 7 storeys – although set back from the road, it will impact on the block opposite, which is only 3 storeys
- Public transport access links (PTAL) only rated at 2 - very poor – which will exacerbate parking issues

Mr Richard Quelch (GVA) and Eric Wong (EADY architecture) spoke as agents, on behalf of the applicant and made the following points:

- Development is addressing the housing crisis
- Discussions with officers have led to a number of revisions: reduction in number of homes, reduction in massing, simplified elevational design, increased affordable housing from 21 to 36%
- Good relationship with landscape
- Redevelopment of an unused site
- Good quality design
- Good proportion of family housing
- Any negative relationship to St Valery mitigated by window patterning.

The Director of Planning and Strategic Transport and planning officers made the following points:

- This is a site with a considerable planning history, but officers are satisfied that previous reasons for refusal have been addressed.
- It is a good quality scheme.
- It provides a good level of family units and 36% affordable housing.
- Density: good quality design goes a long way to addressing density levels. The new London Plan has done away with the density matrix
- Separation distances of 15.4m and 52.8m between the blocks and neighbouring properties gives satisfactory separation. The proposal would be set back approximately 51.4m from 54 Beulah Hill
- Officers consider there is adequate parking

Members commented that they were disappointed at the lack of social rented units. However, the housing association has confirmed this is the best approach on a smallish scheme. Retention of trees is important and there are some significant trees on the site. The new scheme is positive, with a lot of open space around the site.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Jamie Audsley seconded the officer's recommendation and the Committee voted 9 in favour and 1 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 49-51 Beulah Hill, Upper Norwood, London SE19 3DS.

At 8:40pm Councillor Bernadette Khan left the Chamber.

DEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION

A200/17 5.2 17/05566/PRE Council Staff Car Park, Wandle Road, Croydon CR0 1DX

Presentation of a pre-application scheme for the erection a residential building of part 5, 23 and 25 storeys to accommodate approximately 130 flats and 950m² of flexible office, retail and restaurant space; landscaping and public realm works; access and other associated works

Ward: Fairfield

Colm Lacey (Brick-by-Brick Development), Luke Tozer (Pitman Tozer, architects) and Peter Twemlow (DP9 – Planning Agents) 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:

- Air quality – surprise at the high level of pollution around the flyover
- Route under the flyover is positive. Scheme brings positive activity to area at junction of Wandle Road and Scarbrook Road and defines a frontage to Scarbrook Road
- Higher level of affordable housing, including affordable accommodation rented welcomed. Viability of office space discussed
- More family sized units – 3-4 bedrooms?
- Impact on heritage assets
- Landmark building - do we have the right approach and is it welcoming?
- Need a bit more of a punch for a gateway building

PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

A201/17 6.1 17/04306/FUL 51 Selcroft Road, Purley CR8 1AJ

Demolition of existing building and erection of a two-storey building including accommodation within the main roof slope and creation of basement level to

form 7 flats (2 x 1 bedroom, 4 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom) provision of 7 parking spaces, refuse storage and cycle stores
Ward: Purley

The Head of Development Management pointed out an error in the report where the number of car parking spaces given is 7 but there are only 6. An additional 27 objections have been received from local residents but no new issues are covered. There was also a submission from Chris Philp MP.

Mr Adrian Marshall, a resident in Selcroft Road, spoke in objection, raising the following concerns:

- Changing a family dwelling to a building which could house up to 20 people
- Parking will be exacerbated
- Footprint of the building is out of keeping with the streetscene

Mr Matt Corcoran (Planning Director, Sterling Rose) spoke as the applicant, and highlighted the following points:

- High architectural quality
- Considered in keeping with the character of the area
- Family dwellings with a garden area
- Parking provision in accordance with standards
- Providing 7 new homes
- Amenities of neighbouring occupiers are protected

Councillor Donald Speakman, ward Member for Purley, spoke in objection, on behalf of Councillor Simon Brew, representing local residents. He raised the following issues:

- Replacing a beautiful property with a property with inadequate parking
- Residents are concerned about the environment and quality of life

The Director of Planning and Strategic Transport commented that this was a good use of the site. The existing bungalow contributes little to the character of the area.

The Chair stressed that the main issue is to provide new homes. This development is well designed, looking like a house but providing 7 homes close to Purley. It will fit into the character of the area. One is a large family sized home for up to 6 people. The existing garage at the front will be removed, opening up the frontage.

Members agreed the design was pleasant. However, some felt the footprint was much larger, going into a basement and were concerned about the impact on the house below the property.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Joy Prince seconded the officer's recommendation, and the Committee voted 5 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 51 Selcroft Road, Purley CR8 1AJ

A second motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of overdevelopment by dint of its size and being out of character with other properties in the area, proposed by Councillor Jason Perry and seconded by Councillor Chris Wright, thereby fell.

A202/17 **6.2 17/04385/FUL 96A Riddlesdown Road, Purley CR8 1DD**

Demolition of the existing building and the erection of a two storey building including basement and with additional accommodation in roofspace comprising of 5 x two bedroom flats and 3 x three bedroom flats: formation of associated access, and provision of 8 parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse store

Ward: Purley

Mr Rick Aston, a local resident, spoke in objection and raised the following concerns:

- This is a 2-storey building with 2 extra storeys (roofspace and basement) and is therefore a 4-storey building
- No affordable housing is provided
- It is in the middle of single family character homes
- Density and mass do not reflect the character of the area
- Issue of drainage will be exacerbated – risk of flooding

Mr. Jorge Nash (MZA Planning), spoke as the agent, on behalf of the applicant, and made the following points:

- Similar scheme in Riddlesdown Road approved in August
- Communal landscaping to the rear
- Building is in character with the streetscene
- The height is in line with other properties
- It will provide housing with high quality design

Councillor Donald Speakman, ward Member for Purley, spoke in objection, on behalf of Councillor Simon Brew, representing local residents. His main concern was that another good house was being demolished

The Director of Planning and Strategic Transport commented that the design is in keeping with the context. The development will deliver much needed family homes. The flood risk is covered by condition.

Members raised the following positive points:

- One house site will be providing 8 new homes, including three 3-4 bed family units
- Lower level allows easy access for disabled or people with buggies etc from the parking area.
- It is replacing a non-descript 1970s house.

However, there was concern that, due to the gradients, this development does not fit.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Paul Scott proposed and Councillor Joy Prince seconded the officer's recommendation and the Committee voted 5 in favour, 4 against, so planning permission was **GRANTED** for development at 96A Riddlesdown Road, Purley CR8 1DD.

A second motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of overdevelopment and being out of character, proposed by Councillor Chris Wright and seconded by Councillor Luke Clancy thereby fell.

A203/17 6.4 17/03851/FUL 177 Chipstead Valley Road, Coulsdon CR5 3BR

Demolition of the existing bungalow; erection of a two storey development with roof accommodation comprising 3x2 bedroom, 2x1 bedroom and 1x3 bedroom flats; provision of 3 parking spaces; cycle parking and refuse storage; and external amenity space
Ward: Coulsdon West

There were no speakers on this application.

As the guillotine of 10pm had passed, this application was deferred for decision under delegated authority.

(Part 4K of Constitution – paragraph 6.9:

Meetings of the Committee are subject to a guillotine of 10.00pm. After that time, any item on the agenda that has not started to be considered by the Committee is delegated to the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport to determine along the lines set out in the Committee report, unless the Committee has already voted (on a two thirds majority) to defer or adjourn the non-determined item earlier in the meeting.)

A204/17 Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee

There were none.

A205/17 Other planning matters

There were none.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....