

Planning Sub-Committee

Meeting held on Thursday, 3 August 2023 at 8.25pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Michael Neal (Chair);
Councillor Clive Fraser (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Ian Parker, Leila Ben-Hassel, Lara Fish and Sean Fitzsimons

Also Present: Councillor Robert Ward

Apologies: Councillor Humayun Kabir

PART A

6/23 **Minutes of the previous meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 23 February 2023 were agreed as an accurate record.

7/23 **Disclosure of Interest**

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

8/23 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

9/23 **Planning applications for decision**

10/23 **23/01031/FUL - 1 - 11 Neville Road, Croydon, CR0 2DS**

Change of use from existing B1(a) use to 11-bedroom (20 Occupant) HMO Sui Generis with the provision of parking spaces, cycle stand, communal garden, and bin storage (Amended description).

Ward: Selhurst

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

- The permitted planning use of the site was for an office, however, as evidenced by the existing plans that had been submitted the site was currently being used as a as a HMO in a non-authorized manner.

The residents living in Neville Road and surrounding roads submitted a written statement in objection to the application which was read out by the clerk. After the speakers had finished, the committee began the deliberation, during which they raised the following points:

- It was queried whether there had been a previous application that had a resolution to grant, but was not issued as the s106 agreement was not signed. The officer confirmed that this was the case and that the previous application had been finally disposed of.
- It was asked if the application came to committee because of the number of objectors rather than a referral from ward councillor. It was also asked if officers aware whether one of the ward Councillors were one of the objectors. It was confirmed that the application came to committee on the basis of the number of representations received – it was not referred to committee by the ward councillor and an objection was not received from ward councillors.
- It was asked if the site was classed as an office site and was there provision for protection of the site due to its classification. The officer clarified that whilst some commercial uses have protections, an office use in this location would not be protected by planning policy.
- It was asked if officers are happy with the loss of sites in the local area given the possibility of having to relocate businesses. The officer advised that there was no planning policy basis to prevent the loss of office space. It was also noted that there did not appear to be any office uses operating at the site.
- Poorly managed HMO's could lead to street drinking, increased fly tipping etc.
- The communal area was not large enough.
- The communal rooms were not big enough for a house with 18 people.
- The existing building is of poor quality and was in disrepair.
- The proposed development did nothing to improve the street scene in the local area.
- The design, quality of accommodation for future occupiers were not up to the necessary standards.
- The site looks to be poorly managed (doors hanging off etc) despite residents already living on site.
- The application was not up to standards as there was not a need for more HMO's in the north of the borough.
- The previous application for the use of the site as an office space had a proposal to grant, and the development had been turned into a HMO without authorisation.
- There was a need for more houses in the area.
- There had been no Councillor referral and the objections had been covered in the officers report.

- The 11 rooms with 20 occupiers represented an over occupation of the site.
- The property being so close to the railway line did not enable the developer to provide the occupiers with a suitable amount of amenity space.
- There was an opportunity to improve the insulation and to provide more quality housing, but the application did not achieve this.
- There was no impact on adjoining occupiers.

The substantive motion to GRANT the application based on the officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Parker. This was seconded by Councillor Fish.

The motion to grant the application was taken to a vote and carried with three Members voting in favour and three members voting against. The Chair used his casting vote to approve the application.

The Committee RESOLVED to GRANT the application for the development at 1 - 11 Neville Road, Croydon, CR0 2DS.

11/23 **22/00831/HSE - 29 The Ruffetts, South Croydon, CR2 7LS**

Erection of single/two storey side/rear extension, rear dormer and front porch (Retrospective).

Ward: Selsdon and Addington Village

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

- Under permitted development legislation a developer could implement a three-metre-deep extension that's fully 4 metres in height and that would be acceptable and could be a full back position for a developer. In this case the roof was sloping down to 2.7 metres just beyond the three-metre extent. The fact that the roof was sloping down away from the maximum 4 metres high means it's less than what could reasonably be implemented under permitted development for a distance of 3 metres out from the rear of the property. In theory, the developer could knock down the property and build a three-metre-deep extension which was 4 metres in height, which would have a greater impact than the one proposed in the application.

David Rutherford and Councillor Robert Ward spoke in objection to the application. After the speakers had finished, the committee began the deliberation, during which they raised the following points:

- The sloping roof was the main issue which caused concern.

- The start of the slope of the roof was at the height that the flat roof would have been.
- The issue with the sloping roof highlighted the problem of not having supplementary planning document guidance on householder extensions as well as using permitted development rights that allow you to break that 45 degree rules shows that permitted development rights needed to be reviewed and a new supplementary planning document needed to be introduced.

The substantive motion to GRANT the application based on the officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Parker. This was seconded by Councillor Fraser.

The motion to grant the application was taken to a vote and carried with six Members voting in favour.

The Committee RESOLVED to GRANT the application for the development at 29 The Ruffetts, South Croydon, CR2 7LS.

The meeting ended at 9.35 pm

Signed:

.....

Date:

.....