

Report of: Director of Planning and Strategic Transport Author: Pete Smith	Title: Weekly Planning Decisions
---	--

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This report provides a list of cases determined (since the last Planning Committee) providing details of the site and description of development (by Ward), whether the case was determined by officers under delegated powers or by Planning Committee/Sub Committee and the outcome (refusal/approval)

Planning Decisions

- 1.2 Attached as Appendix 1 is the list of delegated and Planning Committee decisions taken between 8th July and 19th July 2019.
- 1.3 During this period the service issued 198 decisions (ranging from applications for full planning permission, applications to discharge or vary planning conditions, applications for tree works, applications for prior approval, applications for non-material amendments and applications for Certificates of Lawful Development). 11 applications were withdrawn by the applicants (which also appear in the list).
- 1.4 Out of the 198 decisions made, 15 were refused (7.5%). Therefore the approval rate was 92.5%.
- 1.5 Notable decisions include the following:
- Part discharge of the landscaping proposals for Queens Gardens – linked to the Taberner House redevelopment. Further discharge will be required once the developer has appointed a landscape contractor to carry out the works. A water feature was included and approved as part of the landscaping scheme – as requested by members as part of the pre application process (LBC Ref 18/04341/DISC).
 - Refusal of planning permission in respect of 69 Selhurst New Road involving the erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to facilitate a change of use of a 5 bed dwelling-house into an HMO (LBC Ref 19/02065/FUL). The reasons for refusal focussed on the loss of a family house and increase don street car parking pressure within an area already experiencing car parking stress.
 - Refusal of planning permission in respect of the Sandrock Public House

at 152 Upper Shirley Road, involving the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, use of the first floor of the public house as a 2 bedroom flat and the erection of a part 3, part 4 storey building to the rear of the public house comprising 19 flats (7x1, 6x2 and 6x3 bedroom units) with associated car parking (LBC Ref 19/01134/FUL). The reasons for refusal focussed on the failure of the scheme to provide sufficient family accommodation, the failure of the scheme (in terms of its scale, mass form and overall design) to reflect the character and appearance of the immediate area and the neighbouring locally listed building, the impact of the development on trees, ecology and flooding, substandard residential accommodation, the impact of the development on car parking capacity and highway safety issues and the failure to satisfactorily deal with the requirement to deliver affordable housing.