

26th October 2023 Planning Committee Addendum

Item 5.1 22/02056/FUL – 1 South Way, Croydon, CR0 8RH

Additional representations

One additional representation has been received since the publication of the Officer report. The key matters raised are summarised as follows:

- Development should be considered by the committee in a wholly retrospective manner.

Officer comment: the officer report sets out that all of the elements in place, other than the boundary treatment and landscaping, are to be considered retrospectively. The boundary treatment and landscaping are yet to be completed in site, so are prospective.

- The report states that external materials are to match existing, yet the applicant has replaced the existing pebbledash with a smooth render to the whole property which has been painted brilliant white. Because of this the development does not respect the appearance of the surrounding area and local character.

Officer comment: the objector is correct and the suggested condition 5 is not appropriate and should be removed from the report (see below). In terms of the smooth render, officers consider there is sufficient variety in the area that the external facing materials are out of character.

- Whilst the applicant has replaced the front area with turf the side and rear gardens remain the same, with artificial grass and no drainage. There has been no planting of shrubs and trees.

Officer comment: officers are aligned with the objector, hence the inclusion of condition 3 to get more soft landscaping into the scheme. As stated in the recommended condition, this would incorporate sustainable urban drainage measures and biodiversity enhancements. These matters can be secured by condition and therefore should not be considered as a ground for refusal.

- The drawing of the host property rear garden is incorrect on the Landscape Proposals document. The rear end of the garden narrows down to a very thin section which is not shown. Photographs were included.

Officer comment: this is noted and the photograph does show the fence to be constructed in the wrong place when compared with the proposed plans. The officer assessment and report is written on the basis of the garden spaces defined on the proposed plans. In the event that planning permission is granted it would be secured via condition 1 (approved plans) and an amendment to condition 4 is recommended to include this fence being moved within 3 months of a decision.

- The development could potentially house 9 people but provides only 1 parking space for 2 units which is totally insufficient. The proposed new unit would not satisfy local housing needs.
Officer comment: access, parking and highway impacts are covered within the officer report.

Report amendments

Condition 4) should be amended to read:

Works to reduce and relocate the boundary walls **and internal fence** in accordance with drawings A1875 P009 **and A1875 P001 RevB** shall be completed within 3 months of this decision.

Condition 5) should be removed.

5) ~~External materials to match the existing~~

Paragraph 3.3 should be amended to read:

- 3.3 At the meeting of the 9th February the referring Ward Councillor and residents advised members that the plans were incorrect in terms of the size of the garden areas. The discrepancies as identified by third parties are assumed to have been a drafting error on the original submission as hand drawn plans had been amended, which may have resulted in distortion of the scale. The amended plans are electronic and Officers have cross referenced the size of the site against the Councils own GIS mapping and can confirm it as an accurate representation of the site and the garden areas appear accurate. These are as follows:
- Proposed garden area for the host property of **188m²**
 - Proposed garden area for the new dwelling of **109m²**

Paragraph 8.13 should be amended to read:

- 8.13 The new dwelling would be provided with a combined garden area of approximately **109m²** (side and back) which would be sited largely towards its flank elevation with some to the rear. The applicant has indicated that a 1.8m high close boarded fence would separate the host property from the proposed dwelling to the rear. While this boundary treatment would extend, in part, up to the edge of the footway it would also extend, in part, the existing boundary wall. The existing (previous) boundary wall fronting West Way **was** up to approximately 1.4m in height and similar boundary treatments can be seen within the wider area. During the course of this application Officers have continued to visit this site and monitor the works, where it became apparent that the applicant had already undertaken works to the boundary to increase its height and altering its position from the proposed plans. As a result, Officers contacted the applicant and asked that the height of the walls and piers be

reduced towards the front of the site and that the position of the side boundary wall be altered to ensure that pedestrian visibility spays were provided as shown in the initial plans. Further to a site visit conducted on the 25th September it was confirmed that these works had not been undertaken. As a result, an appropriately worded condition which requires the remedial works to be undertaken within three months of any grant of permission is recommended. The physical subdivision of the plot through additional boundary treatment would be seen in the context of the existing development pattern, such matters alone would not result in significant harm in character terms.

Paragraph 8.22 should be amended to read:

- 8.22 The proposed development provides amenity space well in excess of the space standards and is of a size suitable for a two-storey property. The host property would maintain an appropriately size amenity/garden space at approximately **188m²**.