

## **24<sup>th</sup> March Planning Committee Addendum**

### **Item 6.1 – 20/06319/FUL – 1 Smitham Bottom Lane, Purley, CR8 3DE**

A further 16 representations were received following the publication of the Officer's report regarding the above planning application. These additional representations do not raise any new matters which haven't already been addressed in the officer's report.

### **Item 6.2 – 21/04742/FUL – 2 Shaw Crescent, South Croydon, CR2 9JA**

A further 19 representations were received following the publication of the Officer's report regarding the above planning application. These additional representations do not raise any new matters which haven't already been addressed in the officer's report.

A further representation has been received from Sanderstead Residents Association stating that units 1, 2, 3 and 4 do not comply with M4(2) standards and that they have study rooms that could be used as bedrooms.

The applicant has submitted a Part M4(2) Statement with the application stating how the proposal will comply with the regulations. A condition is recommended to be added requiring the development to meet M4(2) regulations. The study rooms do not meet the minimum size requirements for bedrooms therefore these dwellings cannot be considered as being 4-bedroom dwellings.

A re-consultation of neighbours was undertaken following the submission of amended plans. Paragraph 3.4 should be replaced with the paragraph below:

*3.4 It should be noted that amended drawings were received during the application period which reduced the number of units from 8 to 7, reduced the amount of hardstanding within the site (by removing the turning head for the refuse collection vehicle) and made minor alterations to the layout and appearance of the houses and site. Additional ecology information was also received at the request of the council's ecologist. These revisions have sought to address consultees and objectors concerns where relevant. A formal re-consultation of neighbours was undertaken by way of letters sent on 24.01.2022 in respect of these changes.*

### **Item 6.3 – 21/04358/FUL – 98 Higher Drive, Purley CR8 2HL**

A further 27 representations were received following the publication of the Officer's report regarding the above planning application. The majority of these points are already addressed in the officer's report. The additional points are:

- The CIL contribution is insufficient.

*Officer response: The CIL contributions are calculated in line with the CIL regulations, and are not negotiable on individual schemes. The individual transport contributions required to mitigate the impacts of the scheme in excess of the CIL contributions are secured separately through a s.106 agreement.*

- It is incorrect to say that cars do not tend to park on Higher Drive as it is a main road as in reality there are many cars parked on the street.

*Officer response. This is a reflection of the results of the parking stress survey, although officers are happy to omit this statement. Para 8.48 should be amended to state that: There are no parking restrictions on the local roads ~~but cars do not tend to park on Higher Drive because it is a main road.~~ Parking stress was found to be 12% which is low*

- It is not specifically mentioned in the report that the sewage pipes run through the garden of 27 Highland Road.

*Officer response: The position of the sewage pipes outside of the site are not a material planning consideration. This issue will need to be addressed by Thames Water. The comment is acknowledged in the summary of neighbours' objections in section 6 of the officer report.*