

Planning Committee

Meeting of held on Thursday, 12 January 2023 at 6.00 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Michael Neal (Chair);
Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Ian Parker, Sean Fitzsimons, Mark Johnson, Humayun Kabir,
Ellily Ponnuthurai and Holly Ramsey, Appu Srinivasan, and Nikhil Sherine
Thampi

Apologies: Councillors Clive Fraser and Joseph Lee

PART A

1/22 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

These minutes were agreed at the previous Planning Committee meeting, and so this item was not required.

2/22 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

3/22 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

4/22 **Development presentations**

There were none.

5/22 **2105373FUL 114-118 Pampisford Road**

Ward: Purley Oaks and Riddlesdown

Officers explained that the development in consideration comprised two sites, one of which would provide 45 flats for market sale and the other of which would provide 22 flats of affordable housing.

In response to members' questions officers explained that:

- The parking provision of the development exceeded that required by the London Plan;
- It was preferred by Registered Providers to keep the market sales and affordable housing flats separate as it was easier for management companies to operate, and it meant that service charges could be kept lower; either "pepper potting" or separate buildings to the same standard would be acceptable in terms of planning policy;
- Keeping the market and affordable housing sites separate also meant management companies had more control over amenities such as landscaping and car parking;
- The buildings had been planned to work with the slope of the land;
- There would be a clause in the Section 106 agreement to ensure that the market sale homes would not be occupied until sufficient progress had been made on the construction of the affordable homes;
- The outdoor space for some of the basement homes exceeded requirements to make up for any shortfall in outlook;
- A flood risk assessment had been carried out and a drainage strategy had been submitted which included a tanked system, green roofs and permeable paving to mitigate flood risk;
- The applicant had a registered provider to take on the affordable housing and their preference was for two-bedroom units and that they found three-bedroom units challenging to rent or sell; and,
- The environmental health team had a number of initiatives to reduce air pollution, which the proposed air quality mitigation contribution would go towards.

The applicant's agent made a statement in support of the development, after which the committee began the deliberation, during which they raised the following points:

- The area had been saturated by developments of flats;
- There had been a detrimental character change of the area in recent times;
- There would be pressure on local amenities that were already over-stretched; and,
- The building's depth and height were much greater than those neighbouring it, meaning that it was over-prominent and dominant;
- There was potential harm to the neighbour amenity from being overbearing and loss of privacy;

- There were concerns about increased traffic on Pampisford Road and speeds of travelling vehicles; and,
- The loss and replacement of trees.

After consideration of the officer's report, Councillor Kabir proposed and Councillor Srinivasan seconded the officer's recommendation, and the Committee voted four in favour, five against, and one abstention, so this motion thereby fell.

A second motion for **REFUSAL**, on the grounds of over-development and over-prominence causing harm to the character of the area; dominance over neighbouring properties, and visual intrusion causing loss of privacy and appearing overbearing to neighbouring properties; and insufficient certainty regarding impacts to biodiversity and protected species, proposed by Councillor Parker and seconded by Councillor Johnson, with five in favour, four against, and one abstention, so planning permission was **REFUSED** for development at 114-118 Pampisford Road.

6/22 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

7/22 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

8/22 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

RESOLVED, to note the weekly Planning decisions as contained within the report.

The meeting ended at 8.00 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....