

PLANNING COMMITTEE
8th April 2021

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 - 20/05326/FUL 37 Kingswood Lane CR6 9AB

Since the publishing of the report, an additional 27 written objections have been received. No additional planning considerations not mentioned in the Committee report have been raised in these representations except for the following:

- People need room to work from home. *[Officer Comment: units internally need to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards and be of good quality, which officers are satisfied these are]*
- Concerns about the accuracy of submitted visualisations including regarding representation of trees *[Officer Comment: visualisations do not form approved/refused drawings. They are helpful to visualise how the proposal may look but would contain some inaccuracies inherent in their creation. Officers are satisfied that the visualisations are typical of those produced for a scheme such as this but agree that they suggest a more mature existing tree specimens at the front of the site]*
- Concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties – the report misidentifies side facing windows of no.35 as being secondary when one window serves a bathroom and the other is the only window to a study / bedroom. A daylight & sunlight assessment has been received for these windows. The results show there will be a reduction in daylight in Vertical Sky Component terms of 54% from 33% VSC to 15% VSC. In terms of Daylight Distribution there will be a reduction to the study/bedroom of 64% from 97% to 35% of this room able to see the sky at the working plane. These reductions are large and very far beyond the 20% reduction target value set out within the BRE guidelines. *[Officer Comment: the report refers to one of the side facing windows at 35 Kingswood Lane as being a secondary window to a living room however an objector has told us that this serves a study / bedroom. They have confirmed that the layout of this property is with a bedroom to the front (served by a front facing window), a study / bedroom to the side (served by the side facing window mis-identified as a lounge) and the lounge is located to the rear – this is considered further below.]*
- Concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties – 45 degrees line is drawn incorrectly from 41

No additional consideration are required regarding the first two points above. Regarding the third, the clarity is welcomed. Previously officers were satisfied that this would have a minimal impact being a secondary window but the proposal would have an impact on this study / bedroom. However officers are satisfied that this impact would be acceptable; the Suburban Design Guide gives very little protection to side facing windows which directly overlook adjacent sites. It should be noted that the window is located off the boundary by the width of

the garage but the scheme would still impact on the window. However as it serves a study / bedroom, to which it is generally accepted that light is less important, is side facing and faces towards the neighbouring property and the impact on the other windows serving this property is minimal, officers are satisfied that this impact is acceptable.

Regarding the final point, the 45degree line is drawn from the conservatory to no 41. Officers are satisfied that this is appropriate.

Paragraph 7.1 erroneously refers to the previous London Plan and should refer to the London Plan 21.

Item 6.2 - 20/04952/FUL 131 Woodcote Valley Road Purley CR8 3BN

Since the publication of the committee report 17 additional representations have been submitted. One representation has raised concern regarding the presence of reptiles and amphibians on or near to the site. The Preliminary Ecology Appraisal identified that the site had low likelihood of reptiles but, as there was some potential, recommends that a reptile precautionary method statement be adopted. This would be secured by condition. The objections point out that there is a pond within a reasonable distance of the site (20m away in the garden of number 135) which may increase the potential for reptiles and so the precautionary approach is not supported. The PEA has been considered by our specialists who are satisfied that it is acceptable, although it does not refer to the pond in question. The site however has been surveyed for these species including for invertebrates, amphibians and reptiles (as it was known that some had been reported in the wider area) and was not found to support habitats which amphibians would use. It was found to support habitat which common (non protected) invertebrates would use so no actions are required. It was found that reptiles may move around the borders of the site hence the precautionary approach. We are satisfied with the approach taken and conditions recommended

Item 6.3 – 103 to 111A High Street, Croydon, CR0 1QG

Since the publication of the committee report a further eight letters of objection have been received. Only one additional issue was raised in these objections from those previously raised. A summary is shown below.

Comments	Officers' response
Concern that Highway Safety Audit submitted highlights a safety concern.	Highway safety audit, has been reviewed by Council's highway engineers and satisfied that there would not be an increased danger to pedestrians or vehicles. It is important to note that this is only stage 1 highway safety audit, which is preliminary design, and that additional design work would be undertaken, which is likely to include further road safety audits at stages 2 (detailed design), stage 3 (when

	completed) and stage 4 (monitoring) to ensure that what is delivered is safe. This is something that would occur post planning if the scheme was to progress.
--	---

Drawings number corrections

Following drawings:

200 Rev 01, 201 Rev 01, 202 Rev 01, 203 Rev 01, 204 Rev 01, 205 Rev 01, 211 Rev 01, 218 Rev 01, 230 Rev 01, 231 Rev 01, 300 Rev 01, 400 Rev 01, 401 Rev 01 and 402 Rev 01

Replaced with:

200 Rev 02, 201 Rev 02, 202 Rev 02, 203 Rev 02, 204 Rev 02, 205 Rev 02, 211 Rev 02, 218 Rev 02, 230 Rev 02, 231 Rev 02, 300 Rev 02, 400 Rev 02, 401 Rev 02 and 402 Rev 02.

In Table above paragraph 1.1 the Total number of four bed units should be 4.

The final line of paragraph 9.78 should read 'Given those windows on sixth to eighth floor are secondary Living/Kitchen/Dining Room windows, the impact of the development on these windows light is acceptable.

Figure 14 is deleted. Correct data already shown in Figure 11.