

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday 4 September 2008

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 08/02345/P – Cullesden Cottage, 30 Cullesden Road, Kenley

1. Since the writing of the Committee report, an additional three representations have been received objecting to the proposal on grounds already detailed in section 5.1 of the report.
2. In addition, two written letters have been received expressing concern over receiving acknowledgements for objection letters the Council had received that they had not submitted. One letter is in support of the proposal and the other has no objection.
3. Conditions 3 and 4 have been deleted from the agenda.
4. Condition 5 has been amended to read as follows:

“Unless otherwise previously agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing the matters approved in compliance with Condition 2 shall be provided before any part of the development is occupied and those in Section A thereof shall also be retained for so long as the development remains in existence

Reason: To ensure that an acceptable standard of development is provided and retained having regard to the policies of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan) “

5. Condition 6 has been amended to read as follows:

“No window or glazed door shall be provided in the north-western or south-eastern elevations other than those shown on the submitted drawings. The first floor rooflight serving the study shall be glazed in obscured glass and retained in that form.

Reason: To protect the privacy of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy UD8 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (The Croydon Plan) “

Item 6.3 08/01592/P 93 Foxley Lane, Purley, CR8 3HP

1. Since the writing of the committee report a letter has been received from Richard Woodhouse of 95 Foxley Lane, who is unable to attend Committee. The objection relates to the loss of or putting at risk of trees.

Item 6.4 08/01755/P Land, Victory Place, SE19

1) The drawing no's should read as follows:-

003, PP 01, 02 Rev A, 03, 04, 05, 003 PE 01 Rev A, 02 Rev B, 03 Rev B

2) One further letter of objection has been received from the Crystal Palace Community Association. This has also been circulated individually to all Members of the Planning Committee and others. In summary, the following planning issues are raised:-

- English Heritage are a statutory consultee and must be notified of any development proposal of this size.
- The Officers report refers to demolition having been granted, but this is for an earlier scheme, not the current application, which should be regarded on its own merits.
- The report makes no reference to traffic movements consequent to the triangle one-way system.
- Members expressed some confusion when considering this application as they had given approval to two previous applications by the same developer. This third application, while visually similar is entirely new and should be considered as such.
- The comments of the North Croydon Conservation Area Advisory Panel (NCCAAP) were not referred to or considered by the Planning Committee.
- Members did not fully discuss the issue of amenity space. CPCA does not consider balconies as amenity space and the communal garden is not overlooked by all occupants of the flats.
- The design and mix of the scheme is discriminatory. The predominance of one-bed flats, 25 in total, limits family accommodation with children.
- No study has been undertaken by Croydon, or the developer, to determine the number of one-bed flats in the immediate area. Failure to conduct such a study of housing need could well lead to an imbalance in the housing requirements of the area.
- The attraction of LEGI money has skewed the application in favour of the Portland Road scheme to the disadvantage of the development proposals in the Triangle.
- The demolition of the existing building has not been considered under appropriate policies.
- Many of the developments in the area demonstrate a uniformity of design, making it impossible to identify the style of any particular architect.
- Poor design quality of the proposal and lack of contextual empathy.
- Residential housing standards are below what is set out in the draft SPD
- Any thought that the applicant may appeal against a refusal is not a planning ground, and should not be used as a consideration in the decision-making process.
- This application allows for issues to be reconsidered.
- A Committee site visit is required.

3) Representation has been received from English Heritage, after being consulted electronically on this application last week. The email reply from the Historic Buildings and Areas Advisor states that:-

'The locus of English Heritage in this case relates firstly to the proposed demolition in Victory Place, within the Upper Norwood Triangle Conservation Area. In my view these buildings do not enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Our

remit with regard to the replacement buildings is limited to whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. We recognise that there may be other factors connected to the application that are beyond our statutory role.'

'These proposals have been considered and in this case English Heritage does not want to offer any comments on the scheme. In the light of this it is recommended that this application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.'

4) It should be noted that Planning Permission has now been granted for 48-50 Portland Road (08/01754/P). This follows completion of the legal agreement on 15th August 2008.

5) A referral from Councillor Pat Ryan is to be submitted at Committee.

**Item 6.5 08/01848/P – Corner of south-eastern Car Park (opposite 48-55)
Central Parade, New Addington, Croydon**

1. On 20th July, a referral was made by Fieldway Ward Councillor Simon Hall. The agents, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, acting on behalf of the applicants Tesco Stores Ltd, responded to Councillor Hall's comments. This detail was included in the addendum to the Committee on Thursday 24 July 2008.

Since the writing of the top-up report for 4 September 2008, a referral has been made by Fieldway Ward Councillor George Ayres, to replace the referral originally made by Councillor Simon Hall. The referral states the following:

"I am writing regarding this planning application whose outcome will affect the district centre that serves my ward, the provision of community services and the livelihood of traders presently located within Central Parade.

It is generally recognized by local residents and users of the community facilities that the existing structures that include the swimming pool, library, Council Offices and the ACA need replacement. There will be a significant amount of disruption during the construction phase of the replacement facilities but it is critical that the disruption should not cause the loss of business to the existing traders. It is equally important to ensure that those community groups presently using the ACA are provided with adequate temporary facilities so as to support their continuance.

Retail activity on Central Parade is highly dependent on car borne trade and consequently the loss of car parking will have an adverse impact on footfall and sales. It is essential that the loss of existing car parking capacity is made good during the construction phase. This will assist existing retailers to maintain their business during the construction phase.

I ask the Committee to make the provision of reasonable alternative parking a condition precedent to the granting of this planning application.

George Ayres

2. The text in paragraph 3.5 of the top-up report after Bullet point 2 should be deleted as this is not directly related to the question asked or to the planning merits of the proposal.

Paragraph 3.5 now reads as follows:

(5) What is the timetable of a typical week at the community centre – how many people visit the centre every day – how many people drive

“A schedule of existing activities that take place at the ACA Building has been provided by the applicant. These include various activities everyday such as Parent and Tots, Line Dancing, Bingo, Waylands Disabled Club and Bethal Prayer Centre, the majority of which will transfer over to the temporary facility. Without carrying out further survey work of existing users it is difficult to quantify the number of users that park their cars at the existing facility and would look to do so for use of the proposed facility. However, the following general points have been made by the applicant:

- The proposed temporary Community Building will be located in the District Centre which is easily accessible by foot to the majority of residents of New Addington for which it is principally there to serve. Furthermore, for those attending activities at the centre from outside the local community, the District Centre is well served by public transport, in the form of bus services and the tram. The intention is not to promote car usage by providing parking specifically for the purpose of users of activities held at the Centre.
- A number of the activities are evening/after school activities and classes which would not conflict with daytime car parking for the shops and the market and should not put a pressure on existing car parking in the Parade.”