

Planning Committee

Meeting held on Thursday, 7 November 2024 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Michael Neal (Chair);
Councillor Clive Fraser (Vice-Chair);
Councillors Ian Parker, Chris Clark, Lara Fish, Sean Fitzsimons, Jessica
Hammersley-Rich, Joseph Lee, Helen Redfern and Appu Srinivasan

Also Present: Councillors Ria Patel and Lynne Hale

Apologies: Councillor Mohammed Islam, Mark Johnson and Humayun Kabir

PART A

66/24 **Disclosure of Interest**

Councillor Clark disclosed that the development presentation at the land to the South East of Croydon College, College Road, Croydon, CR9 1DX fell within his ward.

Councillor Fitzsimons declared that the site for the proposed development at the land to the South East of Croydon College, College Road, Croydon, CR9 1DX partially fell within his ward.

Councillor Fraser declared that the site for the proposed development at the land to the South East of Croydon College, College Road, Croydon, CR9 1DX partially fell within his ward.

67/24 **Urgent Business (if any)**

There was none.

68/24 **Development presentations**

69/24 **23/00397/PRE - Regina Road Housing Estate, Regina Road, South Norwood, London, SE25 4TW**

Demolition and redevelopment of Regina Road Estate, to provide 380 residential units, a pre-school facility, a community use facility and a multiuse

games area along with associated public realm, landscaping, play space, refuse/recycling and car and cycle parking facilities.

Ward: South Norwood

Sarah Chisholm, Neill Campbell and Hanna Williamson attended to give a presentation. They then responded to Members' questions and the issues raised for further consideration.

The Members raised the following points and questions:

Height and Massing

Members asked the developer to explain how stair core provision worked within the proposed development in more detail, specifically around one and two stair core provision.

Members expressed sympathy for the development's massing approach that focused on six storey blocks, but that these blocks would need to be supported by good quality courtyards. Members saw merit in the uniform approach.

Members queried whether the 6-storey approach could lead to a greater number of accessible family units with their own front door.

Members asked the developer about the number of services and associated service charges required for a 6-storey development compared to a taller development.

Members expressed the belief that having a separate tower block for the shared and private ownership tenants could be a problem.

Members thought the introduction of a second tower would not be appropriate. However, some Members believed that a flexible approach was needed.

Members highlighted that heights adjacent to Sunny Bank need to be considered.

Members welcomed the comprehensive approach to redevelopment of the site.

Design

Members asked whether they could vary the colour of the buildings.

Members expressed concern regarding the design and stated that it was characterless and bland.

Members queried whether the flat roofs could be reconsidered. If they were provided could they serve another use.

Members wanted contrast between each of the housing blocks.

Members were not convinced by the stairwells and their appearance.

Members explained that they wanted the developer to ensure that the design of the development was in keeping with the area, however as this was a statement development, the developer should not be afraid to show more imagination.

Members expressed mixed opinions on the proposed red brick. Many of the members felt that the red brick proposed was not in keeping with the area, and therefore preferred a lighter colour. Some Members liked the design and brick colour.

Members expressed concern around balconies design shown, and wished for the developer to explore different options to improve residents' privacy. A suggestion was to use laser cut balustrades.

Members liked that the design created a street pattern which assisted with overlooking.

Members acknowledged the attempt to contextualise the development with villa style blocks, however there was a belief that the developer could take this further to improve the character of the development to ensure that it was more in keeping with the surrounding area.

Members queried whether public art could be introduced so that the character of the development would reflect the history of the site.

Green Space/Amenity Space

Members stated that the location of green spaces were important to ensure that everyone had access, and it was preferred if they were centralised.

Members appreciated the inclusion of allotments on the site, but queried who would have access.

Members asked the developer to ensure the design prevented the allotment from becoming a space for anti-social behaviour.

Members believed that having activities which would allow different residents access would be best for the allotment. Members queried whether the garden and the allotment would be available or everyone including wheelchair users. Members asked the developer about the environmental impact of the potential loss of trees, and how this can be mitigated.

Members stated that the green space that was in situ was not being used. Members queried how the green spaces would be used by various demographic groups and which features would ensure that the space was

safe. There was support for the way the space is being designed to aid this, particularly around aligning with Make Space for Girls research.

Members were concerned that the landscaping would be too informal and believed they needed to have a robust layout.

Members stated that the developer needed to ensure that the children's play space met the necessary requirements.

Members also asked the developers about public and private space on the site and how this would be defined.

Crime

Members asked whether the developer could increase the amount of lighting on site to reduce the risk of crime.

Members also believed that the location of the green spaces would play a major part in the safety on the site.

Members explained that security needed to be in place for the allotment.

Affordable Housing and Mix

Members wanted to see developer explore the provision of first homes to aid first time buyers.

Members expressed the belief that getting the housing mix was crucial and believed that the developer needed to consider how four bedroom properties could be included in the scheme.

Residents/Amenity

Members wanted to arrange a site visit to engage with residents and understand the impact on adjoining occupiers.

Members queried the type of windows proposed on the mews like development on the former garage site as the distance between the blocks and existing residents was only 10m.

Community Space

Members queried what the community space would consist of and how it would be managed.

Members believed that an estate office should be introduced, this would also have CCTV and collect delivery parcels etc.

Members queried on the community use of the facilities and whether the occupiers would be offered a discounted rate.

Parking and Cycling

Members stated that the site was in a high PTAL area and the level of car parking provision should reflect that.

Members believed it was important that car club initiatives were introduced.

Members noted that it was important to incorporate cycle routes into the development to encourage more cycling, especially given that Regina Road was located on designated cycle route.

Heating

Members queried the heating system and stated that a simple system which would work for 24hrs was best. Residents may need support with the new system.

Members queried whether there was anything in the design stage which could prevent mould build-up in units.

Engagement

Members asked the developers how the developers incorporated the feedback from the consultation process into the proposed development.

Concluding Remarks

Members were pleased to see a development coming forward, and it was important to get the development right. Member would like to hear more about residents wishes at a future stage.

Members expressed a desire to learn from best practice on estate regeneration schemes elsewhere across London and perhaps visiting those sites.

Members requested a committee site visit before it comes back to next pre application planning committee.

70/24

22/00887/PRE - Land to the South East of Croydon College, College Road, Croydon, CR9 1DX

Residential-led, mixed-use development with commercial and community uses at ground floor level and associated public realm and landscaping improvements.

Ward: Fairfield

Ian Slover and Cristoph Egret attended to give a presentation. They then responded to Members' questions and the issues raised for further consideration.

Councillor Patel addressed the Committee and highlighted the following points:

- The Green party wanted to see the site used as a green space.
- Croydon College Green should be extended to include this area, however, real consideration needed to be given on how the application and the existing green space would coexist.
- The play area and the trees were welcome but individual private balconies did not compensate for communal external amenity space. She encouraged the developers to include accessible equipment for disabled children and make it more open to the public broadly, not just for residents.
- More consideration for biodiversity was needed, such as the inclusion of bee, bird and bat boxes and green walls or roofs alongside planting.
- Affordable housing was low in the town centre, this led to expensive luxury flats that local people cannot afford to live in.
- The development proposed that all the flats were built to rent, however the development should have a higher number of discounted living, rent and real affordable housing to make the housing truly affordable to lower income households.
- The development would dominate the skyline overlooking Croydon College, Croydon Magistrates Court and Fairfield and would likely be visible from many listed buildings.
- As well as Chatsworth Conservation Area where many residents raised concerns about the height of the existing buildings impacting their skyline view and this development would appear more prominently from this area.
- The local impact area could be massive and in the five surrounding wards, the development could change the existing character of the local area.
- The area is notorious for its wind tunnel microclimate which the height of this building would likely increase, as well as blocking daylight and sunlight and causing overlooking.
- There was a lack of consideration regarding the trams at East Croydon.
- The embodied carbon and the whole life carbon should be assessed and taken into consideration.
- The site currently is used as a storage site for neighbouring developments, and so the developers may want to consider where these materials should go and would be accounted for.
- There was a massive lack of GPs surgeries and dentists in the area, and the developments provision for these was welcomed.
- The cycle storage and the provision for disabled drivers were welcomed, although there were questions regarding the provision of parking bays for delivery drivers.

- Questioned consultation, what people's comments were regarding the development and consultee comments, raising concerns about transparency for Members and the public.
- It was concerning that there were no public comments given the size of the application and this likely spoke to the lack of engagement from both the developer and the Council.
- The red brick would stand out against quite a lot of the other surrounding buildings.

The Members raised the following points and questions:

Use

Important site and for Croydon in terms of the cultural offering.

Land use questions around the scheme being residential led or is it a missed opportunity.

Importance of the space as a destination.

Support for food-hall, NHS facility and nursery space.

How could the scheme highlight the College and Fairfield Halls from a cultural perspective.

Design

Some members supported the height across the scheme.

Principle of height and distribution suitable.

Towers appear subservient to Ten Degrees and College Tower.

Challenges around colour of buildings and mid-century heritage - although not unanimous opposition for pink.

Some support for a different colour to Ten Degrees and College Tower and possibly softer tones.

Support for the design approach to the North and South towers - like the aspects brought through from the NLA tower, their shape and geometric features.

Welcome octagonal forms.

Reiterated the importance of good design.

Heritage impacts - less of an impact from Town Centre, but consideration for Fairfield Halls and Croydon College important.

Support for ceramic features and greater Arnhem references.

Some felt the Western block was incongruous in design and needed to be more civic.

Some members felt western building look quite bland.

Some support for base to western block but upper elevations need work.

Some members felt Western Block was too large.

Consideration should be given to setting back the Western Block.

It was questioned whether the scheme gave an appropriate termination to College Green.

Layout

Support for site layout and Hazle dean Walk bridge.

Questions around quality of public space.

Lift access challenges and navigating route up to Hazledean Bridge.

Positive landscaping proposals.

Engagement and relationship with Fairfield Halls and Croydon College important.

Public space - need to be clear what is public and private?

Other matters

Questions around amenity space within units and Juliette balconies.

Some support for internalised amenity space.

Children's play space needs to be accessible to all.

Importance of wind as a consideration.

Colonnade and Hazledean Walk safety issues and questions how Arnhem.

Gardens are safe dusk and dawn.

Disappointing affordable housing only 20%.

Design locks in affordable housing product - is there scope in the western block for different tenure.

71/24 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 October 2024 be signed as a correct record.

72/24 **Planning applications for decision**

73/24 **Items referred by Planning Sub-Committee**

There were none.

74/24 **Other planning matters**

There were none.

75/24 **Weekly Planning Decisions**

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

The meeting ended at 9.34 pm

Signed:

Date: