

## Planning Committee

Meeting of Croydon Council's Planning Committee held virtually on Thursday, 21 May 2020 at 6pm 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 Paul Scott (Vice-Chair);  
Councillors Toni Letts, Jason Perry and Gareth Streeter

**Apologies:** Councillor Muhammad Ali, Sherwan Chowdhury, Joy Prince, Scott Roche and Ian Parker

### PART A

90/20 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 7 May 2020 be signed as a correct record.

91/20 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

92/20 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

93/20 **Development presentations**

94/20 **19/05282/PRE The Fair Field (College Green), Park Lane, Croydon**

Public Realm scheme to transform the Fair Field (also known as College Green and Fairfield Gardens) into a world class public space

Ward: Fairfield

Stuart Cade from MICA Architects Ltd and Charles Holland from Charles Holland Architects representing the applicant attended the virtual meeting 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:

**Overall design intent and approach:**

- There was general support for the scheme and consensus that it is an exciting project.
- There was discussion around the visual connection to the area with Members suggesting that the scheme should have a more visual connection to the wider history and culture of Croydon.
- There was a suggestion that the flags shown in the scheme could be redesigned to celebrate the multicultural heritage of Croydon and a suggestion of incorporating a peace garden or equivalent.
- Questions were raised around the maintenance of the scheme, and the team advised that a budget has been set aside for the scheme and it has been designed to be of low-maintenance.

**Water field area and soft landscaping:**

- The waterfront feature was welcomed and Members heard that water jets will be part of the water field.
- There were questions around the seasonality and use of the water feature.

**Park Lane frontage and Fairfield Halls forecourt:**

- There was discussion around the space for drop off for Fairfield Halls and the applicant confirmed that this was not due to change. There was general consensus that the scheme is not making the most of the forecourt area and more could be done with further trees suggested to make the most of this space.
- Members also questioned the design of paving across Wellesley Road.
- There was a question about the design of the wayfinding structures and how the design reflects Croydon.

**Play field area:**

- There were questions around the balance of the green space for the college students and whether there needed to be a more structured area for this use. Members were advised that the play space area has space for football, basketball and skateboarding use.

**Kiosk structures:**

- There were discussions around the design of the kiosks which members felt could be more inspiring and have wider connection to Croydon. Members questioned whether these could be designed to reflect historic structures in Croydon and it was suggested that the design could reflect landmarks from other parts of the borough which are not visible from the site.

There were questions around the use, and whether it could be structured as play structures, or peace garden or equivalent. Members suggested it was key to ensure adaptability to a range of users.

**George Street step free route:**

- Members heard that the scheme has been designed to provide a step free level access from Fairfield Halls connecting to George Street.

*At 8:00pm the planning committee adjourned for a short break.*

*At 8:06pm the planning committee resumed the meeting.*

The Chair thanked the applicants for their presentation, and looked forward to their application returning to the Committee at a later stage.

95/20 **Planning applications for decision**

The Chair announced that the agenda application items would be heard in the following order: 18/06069/FUL 4-20 Edridge Road, Croydon, CR0 1EE; 19/04500/FUL 1 Smitham Downs Road, Purley, CR8 4NH; 19/06036/FUL 41 Woodcrest Road, Purley, CR8 4JD and 18/04811/FUL 216-220 Brigstock Road, Thornton Heath, CR7 7JD

96/20 **18/06069/FUL 4-20 Edridge Road, Croydon, CR0 1EE**

The erection of a part 33 storey, part 11 storey building providing 230 residential units (Use Class C3).

Ward: Fairfield

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

Mr Ash Kumar, the applicant's agent, provided a written statement in support of the application. This was read out by the committee clerk.

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.

The substantive motion to **APPROVE** the application based on the officer's recommendation was taken to the vote having been proposed by Councillor Paul Scott. This was seconded by Councillor Toni Letts.

The substantive motion was carried with four Members voting in favour and one Member abstained their vote.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **GRANT** the application for the development of 4-20 Edridge Road, Croydon, CR0 1EE.

97/20 **19/04500/FUL 1 Smitham Downs Road, Purley, CR8 4NH**

Demolition of existing three storey house and detached garage and erection of a five storey building (including basement and accommodation within the roof space) to provide 9 units as well as associated new vehicular access, car parking, cycle/refuse storage and soft/hard landscaping.

Ward: Coulsdon Town

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

Councillor Luke Clancy provided a written statement in objection to the application. This was read out by the committee clerk.

Ms Neal Thompson, the applicant's agent, provided a written statement in support of the application. This was read out by the committee clerk.

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.

The substantive motion to **APPROVE** the application based on the officer's recommendation was taken to the vote having been proposed by Councillor Paul Scott. This was seconded by Councillor Toni Letts.

The substantive motion was carried with four Members voting in favour and one Member abstained their vote.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **GRANT** the application for the development of 1 Smitham Downs Road, Purley, CR8 4NH.

98/20 **19/06036/FUL 41 Woodcrest Road, Purley, CR8 4JD**

Demolition and erection of a three storey building with accommodation in the roof, comprising of 8 units, with associated car parking, removal and installation of a crossover, cycle parking, refuse storage and landscaping.

Ward: Coulsdon West

The officers presented details of the planning application with no questions for clarification.

Mr and Mrs Peter Gee and Mr and Mrs Ronald Standen provided a joint written statement in objection to the application. This was read out by the committee clerk.

Mr Tim Humphries, the applicant's agent, provided a written statement in support of the application. This was read out by the committee clerk.

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.

The substantive motion to **APPROVE** the application based on the officer's recommendation was not supported.

Councillor Scott proposed a motion to **REFUSE** this application for further development on the grounds that the scheme has taken the wrong approach in excavating the frontage to match the adjacent roof height; the scheme is out of character; the design is not in the spirit of the SDG resulting in over development of the site; it has a poor quality design in reference to the gable roof being too big and the balcony openings being too small. The design is too wide within the site and the depth of excavation and the retaining walls is out of character. This was seconded by Councillor Letts.

The motion to refuse was put to the vote carried with all five Members unanimously voting in favour.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **REFUSE** the application for the development of 41 Woodcrest Road, Purley, CR8 4JD.

99/20      **18/04811/FUL 216-220 Brigstock Road, Thornton Heath, CR7 7JD**

Removal of existing structures, demolition of existing building, alterations erection of part three storey / part four storey building, provision of retail use (A1 Use Class) at lower ground floor and ground floor, provision of 8 flats comprising 1 x 1 bedroom flat at rear lower ground floor, 2 x 1 bedroom flats at rear ground floor, 2 x 1 bedroom flats, 1 studio flat, and 1 x 3 bedroom flat at first floor, and 1 x 3 bedroom flat at second floor (in roof space), provision of associated refuse storage and cycle storage, provision of one off-street parking space at rear.

Ward: Bensham Manor

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

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.

The substantive motion to **APPROVE** the application based on the officer's recommendation was taken to the vote having been proposed by Councillor Paul Scott. This was seconded by Councillor Jason Perry.

.....  
The substantive motion was carried with all five Members unanimously voting in favour.

The Committee therefore **RESOLVED** to **GRANT** the application for the development of 216-220 Brigstock Road, Thornton Heath, CR7 7JD.

100/20 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

101/20 **Other planning matters**

102/20 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

The report was received for information.

103/20 **Planning Appeal Decisions (April 2020)**

The report was received for information.

The meeting ended at 9.27 pm

**Signed:**

**Date:** .....